











**OCCASIONAL SERMONS,**

**PREACHED IN**

**WESTMINSTER ABBEY.**



# OCCASIONAL SERMONS,

FREACHED IN

WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

---

BY

CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D.

CANON OF WESTMINSTER.

---

Second Edition.

---

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1850.

LONDON :  
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

# CONTENTS.

---

## SERMON I.

	PAGE
COUNSELS AND CONSOLATIONS IN TIMES OF HERESY AND SCHISM. .	1

## SERMON II.

ON PLEAS ALLEGED FOR SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH . .	19
---	----

## SERMON III.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM ; WITH REFERENCE TO THE OPINION OF PREVENIENT GRACE . . . . .	43
---	----

## SERMON IV.

AN ENQUIRY,—WHETHER THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAY BE INTERPRETED IN A CALVINISTIC SENSE?— PART I. THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE COMPARED WITH THE TENETS OF CALVIN . . . . .	69
--	----

## SERMON V.

THE ENQUIRY CONTINUED.—WHETHER THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WERE FRAMED BY PERSONS HOLDING CALVINISTIC OPINIONS ; AND WHETHER THEY MAY BE INTERPRETED IN A HYPOTHETICAL SENSE?—PART II. ARGUMENT FROM INTERNAL EVIDENCE . . . . .	97
---	----

## SERMON VI.

	PAGE
THE ENQUIRY CONTINUED.—WHETHER THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WERE FRAMED BY PERSONS HOLDING CALVINISTIC OPINIONS; AND WHETHER THEY MAY BE INTERPRETED IN A HYPOTHETICAL SENSE?—PART III. ARGUMENT FROM EXTER- NAL EVIDENCE . . . . .	129

## SERMON VII.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN 1711 AND 1850 . . . . .	167
--	-----

## SERMON VIII.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME IN 1850 . . . . .	189
--	-----

# SERMON I.

---

## COUNSELS AND CONSOLATIONS IN TIMES OF HERESY AND SCHISM.

---

1 COR. xi. 18, 19.

*I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest.*

THE word *Heresy* properly signifies *choice*, and in the New Testament it means an exercise of the will of man adopting doctrines at variance with the word of God, and publicly and pertinaciously maintaining them. Hence St. Peter speaks of *false Teachers bringing in privily damnable heresies*<sup>1</sup>, and St. Paul instructs Titus: *A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself*<sup>2</sup>; that is, condemned *by his own act*, which is one of presumption, in hoping for salvation on terms invented by himself, in opposition to those prescribed by Almighty God.

The Apostle St. Paul, in his Epistles to the Corinthian Church, deplores the existence of religious *divisions*

<sup>1</sup> 2 Pet. ii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Titus iii. 10, 11.

there. *It hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, that there are contentions among you*<sup>3</sup>. *I hear there are divisions among you*<sup>4</sup>. And since religious strifes are ever associated with *errors in doctrine*, he adds, there must be also *heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest*.

If the Apostle St. Paul were living in our own age and country, there is surely too much reason to fear, that he would speak to *us* in terms of censure and reproof equally severe with those which he addressed to the Corinthians. How little of unity and brotherly love seems to survive among us! Almost on every side we hear the harsh sounds of fierce disputing on religious questions. The harmony of families is disturbed by strife and debate; the dearest ties are severed; and coldness, estrangement, suspicion, and bitterness prevail, where nothing ought to exist but kindness, gentleness, and love. The spirit of religious disputation has invaded our social meetings; it makes itself heard at our tables and at our firesides; it distracts our public assemblies; our Newspapers are full of it. Truly might the Apostle say to *us*, *I hear there are divisions among you*.

This state of things is deeply to be lamented, and calls on all for penitential sorrow, and fervent prayer, and holy resolutions of amendment. And let us remember, for our comfort and encouragement, that a blessing is promised to all who labour in healing divisions, and restoring unity. *Blessed are the Peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God*<sup>5</sup>.

Still, we know from the lips of Our Blessed Lord Himself, that *offences there will be*<sup>6</sup>; and as the world draws nearer to its close, so we are led to apprehend

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. i. 11.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 18. See also 1 Cor. iii. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. v. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xviii. 7. Luke xvii. 1.



that the sound of religious error and religious discord will wax louder and louder. *When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find the<sup>7</sup> Faith on earth?*

Hence it befits us all to prepare for the worst. And here we have gracious promises. Nothing *can harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good<sup>8</sup>. All things work together for good to them that love Christ<sup>9</sup>*. It is our duty not to *be overcome of evil, but to overcome evil with good<sup>1</sup>*. Even out of Heresies and Schisms good may be educed. And this is what St. Paul teaches us in the text: *There must be heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest.*

The circumstances of our times, to which I have already referred, are such as to render it very profitable and necessary to enquire—How may this be effected? How may good be elicited by us from the religious discords and errors around us?

To this subject, therefore, let us now address ourselves.

1. Here some preliminary cautions are requisite. “*There must be heresies among you.*” Let us not *therefore* imagine, that heresies *ought to be* among us. Such is the corruption of the heart, and such the malice and wiliness of Satan, that heresies *there are*, and *will be*: God foresees them, and forewarns us of them. And (as we shall show) God also teaches us how to bring good out of them. But let us not imagine that false doctrines and factious divisions can ever be pleasing to the God of Truth and Love. Our Lord warns us against such a supposition. It is *impossible but that offences will come; But woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh<sup>2</sup>*.

<sup>7</sup> τὴν πίστιν. Luke xviii. 8.

<sup>9</sup> Rom. viii. 28.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xviii. 7.

## 2. Another warning here.

It is often alleged by the sceptic and the scoffer, that, if *Christianity* were of *divine* origin, there would be *unity* among *Christians*; and that, if belief in its doctrines were necessary to salvation, and if everlasting punishment were to be the consequence of unbelief, the *evidence* of its doctrines would have been so clearly written, as it were with a sunbeam, that doubt or difference with regard to them would have been impossible.

These allegations, however specious, are very erroneous.

The divisions among Christians are no fruit of Christianity. They are the consequences of those things which Christianity condemns: they are the result of those things which it discovers to us, and which it is the special office and purpose of Christianity to enable us to overcome, namely, our own weakness and corruption and Satan's malignity and power. Wherever we see the tares of error and strife in the field of the Church, there we ought to say, *An Enemy hath done this*<sup>3</sup>. But wherever Christianity *really* influences the heart, there strifes abate, and there love abounds. "See how these Christians love one another," was the language of the heathen world concerning the first Christians. And in due time, when our period of trial shall be over, and when Christian *Patience* shall *have had her perfect work*<sup>4</sup>, (as will be the case when Christ has conquered all His enemies,) then divisions will disappear, and God will be all in all—and GOD *is* LOVE<sup>5</sup>.

In the mean time, the existence of *strifes* in the world, so far from invalidating the proof of Christianity, serves to confirm it; for Christ predicted them; *I am come to send fire on the earth. Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather*

<sup>3</sup> Matt. xiii. 28.

<sup>4</sup> James i. 4.

<sup>5</sup> 1 John iv. 8.

*division*<sup>6</sup>. Christ knew that (such is man's perverseness) the Gospel of Peace itself would be an occasion of war. He knew that He Himself, *the precious Stone of Zion*, would be *for the fall of many in Israel, a stone of stumbling and rock of offence*<sup>7</sup>. And He warned His disciples that the time would come, when—*There should be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three*<sup>8</sup>. And—*A man's foes shall be they of his own household*<sup>9</sup>. And therefore we must not be staggered by the discord around us. Rather it should increase our faith in Christ. It proves Him to be a true Prophet. *Be not deceived: behold, I have foretold you all things, that, when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them*<sup>1</sup>.

Again: in respect to *errors in doctrine*.

Errors in doctrine do not proceed from want of clearness in the evidence of Christian Revelation, but from our reluctance to receive it. Passion and Prejudice blind our eyes; our evil lives make us unwilling to believe a Religion which condemns our vices. *We love darkness, because our deeds are evil*<sup>2</sup>. And we cannot discern spiritual things without divine grace, for which we do not pray as we ought, or we stifle it by bad habits. We close our eyes; and say there is no light. The fault, let us be assured, is not in the Gospel but in ourselves. *But* let men's lives be such as the Gospel enjoins, and they will believe the Gospel. If they do *God's will, they will know of the doctrine*<sup>3</sup>. Let them be meek and humble, holy and charitable, and the scales will fall from their eyes, and they will be astonished at their former blindness: *in God's light they will see light*<sup>4</sup>.

Let us observe also, that men are free agents, and

<sup>6</sup> Luke xii. 51.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. xxviii. 16. Rom. ix. 33. Luke ii. 34.

<sup>8</sup> Luke xii. 52.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. x. 36. <sup>1</sup> Mark xiii. 23. John xvi. 4.

<sup>2</sup> John iii. 19.

<sup>3</sup> John vii. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Ps. xxxvi. 9.

that this world is their state of probation for another ; and the evidence of Christianity is exactly suited to try us. It does not overwhelm us by violence. It does not force us to believe. If it did, there would be no trial ; we should not be men, but machines. But it proves us, whether we have honest and truth-loving hearts ; it tries us, whether we will virtuously exercise, or viciously abuse, those faculties and opportunities which God gives us. Its evidence is so admirably adjusted and beautifully balanced, that it preponderates in proportion to our disposition to receive it. Thus it fathoms and explores our minds, and brings demonstrative proof out of our hearts concerning our own characters, and so makes us to pronounce a judicial verdict on ourselves.

3. Next, it must be remembered that though Christians differ from each other, and maintain their differences with earnestness, yet, by means of these very differences, and by the earnestness with which they maintain them, they show that they are all *agreed* in *one thing*, namely, in the persuasion that all men ought to embrace the religion *which is true*, and to promote it to the best of their ability. And the generality of this persuasion is an argument that it is implanted in our nature by God : and it is therefore a protest from heaven against religious *Indifference*. Thus, even the religious divisions of Christians, so far from confirming the Gallios of this world in their apathy, *ought* to awaken them from their slumber, and to stimulate them to examine and embrace the truth.

4. Another error, into which some are betrayed in contemplating the divisions of Christians, is the following, which appears to be specially prevalent in the present times among those whose passions are ardent and their wills strong, rather than their intellects clear, and their spirits chastened by divine grace.

They deplore the prevalence of strife, they are distressed by the war of controversy raging in society, in their neighbourhood, perhaps in their families; they long for peace, and yearn for unity. In the battle of opinions, *one* particular form of Christianity, dressed in an alluring garb, presents itself to them, and promises to them what they earnestly desire; it engages to rescue them from the storm, and to convey them into still waters, and to shelter them in a fair haven, where they shall never more be distressed by the winds and waves of Controversy, but shall safely ride at anchor in a calm of heavenly peace. The Church of Rome unfolds her arms and invites them to her bosom, and says, Here, and here only, can you find rest. They are beguiled by her specious words, and yield to her seductive offers; they sink into a trance-like slumber, and imagine themselves at peace. I pause not here to enquire, whether there *is* unity or no in the communion of Rome? But this is the real question,—Is there *true* unity? is there the unity of Truth? is there the unity of Christ? Does she teach what He taught? does she believe what St. Paul believed? This, I say, is the question. If she does not, then her boasted unity must be called an unholy *conspiracy* against the God of Unity and Truth; and the closer such unity is, the worse it is; and therefore every true Christian, every sincere lover of godly liberty and holy unity will exclaim,—*My soul come not into her secret, unto her assembly mine honour be not thou united* <sup>5</sup>.

II. Let us now proceed to consider the *good* which is to be educed from religious controversies. “There must be heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest.”

1. First, then, let us observe, with gratitude to God,

<sup>5</sup> Gen. xlix. 6.

Whose peculiar attribute it is to bring good out of evil, that the Doctrines of Christianity have been established more firmly, even through the denial of them by false teachers. The promulgation of heresies has excited the zeal and evoked the learning of orthodox Theologians, who have been led thereby to a more careful study of the Scriptures, and to a more earnest and emphatic declaration of the Truth as taught in the Word of God. Thus the perverse teaching of heretics in the third and fourth centuries concerning the Nature of the Second and Third Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity elicited from the lips of the Church the clear and full manifestoes concerning those fundamental articles of her faith, which she propounded in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds; which have ever since remained as the most effectual safeguards against heresy in those vital respects. And to omit other instances of a similar kind, it cannot be doubted, my brethren, that the unhappy Controversy which has distracted the Church of England in our own days, and still distracts it, has led many persons, who would *otherwise* have scarcely *reflected at all* on that solemn subject, to examine carefully into the foundations of their Christian life, and has brought them, under God's blessing, to a sound and intelligent appreciation of the inestimable privileges to which they were admitted, and the sacred duties to which they were pledged by the terms of the Covenant of Baptism.

2. Again, in other respects, the words of the Apostle are true: *There must be heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest.*

The word here used by St. Paul for *approved* is properly applied to precious *metals*, and describes *their* condition when smelted from dross by the action of fire, and tested by certain criteria by which their purity is ascertained. And St. Paul intends to say, that they

of whom he speaks are like gold tried in the fire, and that their Christian virtues are made manifest in the sight of men, Angels, and of God.

Let us consider then, how through the prevalence and agency of religious strifes and errors, which are compared here to the fires of a furnace, Christians are proved and manifested like *silver purified seven times in the fire*<sup>6</sup>. How is it, that “thereby the trial of their faith being much more precious, than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, will be found unto praise, and honour, and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ<sup>7</sup>.”

This appears in a very clear and beautiful manner, from the figurative emblems under which religious error and strife are described in Holy Scripture.

The falling of men, especially of religious Teachers, from the faith, is frequently compared in the Scripture to the fall of Stars from heaven<sup>8</sup>. And religious error is often there represented as thick gloom. This being the case, What, let us enquire, is the description there given of the faithful Church, retaining pure doctrine, and preaching it to the world? She is pourtrayed in Scripture as the Woman clothed in the Sun, and standing on the Moon, and crowned with twelve Stars<sup>9</sup>. Now, what is it which makes the brightness of the Woman's form more visible, and its brilliancy more splendid? It is the contrast of the *gloom* around her,—What is it which gives greater lustre to the *fixed* constellation on her brow? It is the *fall* of stars about her. The war of the elements makes her calmness more beautiful, more glorious, more marvellous. Her faith is proved by the shock; she is made more manifest by it; and God is glorified thereby.

<sup>6</sup> Ps. xii. 6.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Pet. i. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Luke xxi. 25. Rev. viii. 10, 11. ix. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. xii. 1.

3. And as it is with the Church, so it is with every faithful member of it. Why was Enoch translated? Because *in a corrupt age he walked with God* <sup>10</sup>. Why does the name of Elijah shine so brightly? Because he stood almost alone, like a burning and shining light, in the *midst of a crooked and perverse generation*. Among all the scenes of the life of St. Paul, none is more glorious than that in which he represents himself as abandoned by his friends, remaining almost alone, in his old age, at Rome, and ready to be offered up, and rejoicing in his lot <sup>1</sup>. And, to pass to later times, How could Athanasius have been approved, how could his unflinching faith, and unwearied patience, and indomitable courage, in the glorious cause of maintaining the doctrine of Christ's Divinity, have been made manifest, if the errors of Arianism had not almost overwhelmed the world with a flood for fifty years? If Pelagius had never disparaged Divine Grace, if Donatus had never limited the privileges of the Church to his own sect, if Manes had never broached his false theory of two principles of Good and Evil in the government of the world, where would have been the crown of glory which encircles the head of Augustine? And to speak of our own country, why do the names of our own Martyrs shine so brightly? Because in the face of danger and of death they maintained the pure faith of the Gospel; because their names are illumined by the flames in which their bodies were consumed.

Thus, the prevalence of error has ever furnished glorious occasions for the triumph of Truth. It is the battle which tries the Soldier, it is the storm which proves the Pilot. They who have fought the good fight, and have been faithful even unto death, they have been approved and made manifest, they have

<sup>10</sup> Gen. v. 24. Heb. xi. 5.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 6. 10.



given signal evidence of the power of God's grace, and have gained a crown of life which fadeth not away.

Hence, therefore, we see, that however the world about us may be overclouded with error and distracted by strife, yet, in these very errors and strifes we have the proper elements and best materials for the exercise of our Christian virtue: they excite our vigilance, they evoke our courage, they inspire our hope. These trials are the leaves and blossoms of which our crown of glory is to be woven. They are like the sound of the silver trumpets in the ears of every true Israelite, reminding him that he is a soldier of Christ, and calling on him to gird on his armour for the battle, and to follow the Captain of his salvation, under Whose banner he is enlisted as a soldier.

4 But, perhaps, you may say that *you* are not born to take an active part in religious debates; your lot is cast in *private* life; you are not qualified or disposed to engage in public discussions; and yet, in the retirement of *private society*, you are vexed by religious controversy, and distracted by strange doctrines;—and what *good* can *you* elicit from them? You are not an Athanasius or an Augustine. How then can *you* derive benefit from them—how can you be *approved* and *made manifest* by their means?

To this I answer. Who is your Judge? Not man, but God. The *world*, indeed, knows the names of Athanasius and Augustine; but there are many persons,—many men, many *women*, many *children*,—who will *hereafter* bear the Martyr's Palm and wear the Confessor's Crown, whose names are unknown to men. And why will they be so honoured? Because they have cherished in their hearts the *spirit* of Martyrs and Confessors, and have stedfastly maintained the faith. And though unnoticed by men, have been marked and approved by God.

In further illustration of this truth, consider another scriptural figure of the Church, and therein see *your own* duty. She is described in the Song of Solomon, as *the Lily among Thorns*<sup>2</sup>. She dwells amid the briars and brambles of contradictions, and yet she retains her serenity and her sweetness, her purity, her quietness, and her modesty. Such is the soul of every true Christian in this life; it is beset by strifes and errors, not only by the wayside of life, but in the privacy of domestic retirement; yet it maintains its beauty and its lustre; it gleams in the dark shade, and whether men mark it or no, it shines to the eye of God.

All, therefore, of whatever condition, may find abundant exercise for their Christian gifts and graces in the midst of the trials and difficulties which beset them in the present times. Let us be assured that the most dangerous of all states is one of spiritual apathy and lethargy. When the inward house is *empty, swept, and garnished*<sup>3</sup>, when the soul enjoys worldly peace, then it is too apt to become careless and dwell at ease; then there is great danger lest it sink into carnal security, and seven evil spirits should enter in and dwell there. *We*, therefore, have reason to be *thankful, that such is not our state*; we have reason to be thankful that the religious discussions which we hear, do not allow us to pass our lives in a dream. They call loudly upon us to reflect, to enquire, to examine, to embrace, and to maintain the truth, not from prescriptive custom, or hereditary tradition, but because we *know it to be the truth*, and because we are able and ready to give to *every man that asketh a reason of the hope that is in us*<sup>4</sup>. They sift and prove us, whether we are chaff or wheat. Thus, in a certain sense, *Controversies* become *privi-*

<sup>2</sup> Cant. ii. 2.<sup>3</sup> Matt. xii. 44.<sup>4</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 15.

*leges.* They increase our responsibilities; and we shall have to give an account hereafter, whether, now *that heresies abound, we have been among those that are approved, and made manifest thereby.*

5. Again: It is by the exercise of Christian virtues that we become *prepared and qualified for our eternal inheritance in heaven.* Patience and Love, Hope and Faith, these are the graces which must carry us thither.

And what better exercise of Patience can we have than in the prevalence of strife about us? Now, we see a living verification of our Lord's parables, in which He describes the mixed and imperfect state of the visible Church, and by which He warns us *not to separate ourselves from it, because it is not as pure on earth as it will be hereafter in heaven.* We cannot live and grow but in the Church, which is the field that the *Lord has blessed* <sup>5</sup>, and has sown *with good seed* <sup>6</sup>, although it be overgrown with tares which are to *remain unto the harvest.* We may not *break the net,* although it has bad fish within it as well as good <sup>7</sup>. Now comes home to us the precept of our Lord, *In patience possess ye your souls* <sup>8</sup>; and *He that endureth unto the end shall be saved* <sup>9</sup>.

What better exercises of Trust can we have in Christ, than when the waves run high, and the vessel of the Church seems almost plunging in the abyss, and when Our Lord appears to be asleep. Asleep He may be as man: but GOD neither slumbers nor sleeps. And HE will quell the storm when He thinks best. Let us confidently believe that, If we are in the ship of the Church with Christ, we are most safe, when *we can do least.* They who wake Him imagine that His

<sup>5</sup> Gen. xxvii. 27.      <sup>6</sup> Matt. xiii. 24.      <sup>7</sup> Matt. xiii. 47.

<sup>8</sup> Luke xxi. 19.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. x. 22.

Godhead sleeps, but they who wait for Him, know that He watches everlastingly. He says to *them*, *Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith*<sup>1</sup>? If it be true, that vain is the help of man, and of *private* men, nay, even of Apostles themselves, it may be often true, that in great emergencies they have nothing left but to pray, and *study to be quiet*<sup>2</sup>, and to serve God diligently in their proper callings, and not to increase the confusion by going beyond their sphere of duty, and by vainly assuming to themselves the right to command the storm, then is the best trial and noblest triumph of our confidence in GOD.

Again; What more urgent occasion for the exercise of Love, than the sight of religious divisions? When the Church is distracted by parties, then, surely, is the time to say, *O pray for the peace of Jerusalem, they shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and plenteousness within thy palaces*<sup>3</sup>. When some about us, some whom we are bound to respect, some whom we dearly love, are guilty of Schism, or fall away from the faith and embrace false doctrines, and, perhaps, teach them to the world, thus becoming like erring stars, wildly shooting from their spheres and plunging themselves in gloom; what more strong constraint than this upon us to fly to God with prayers and tears, that *He would strengthen such as do stand and raise up them that fall, that He would bring again into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived*?

6. Once more. Like as the winds of heaven and the waves of the sea, when we are on a voyage, remind us that we are yet on the broad ocean, and are *not yet* arrived in the *harbour*, and make us *wish* for the *shore*; so the dark clouds of error which hang over

<sup>1</sup> Mark iv. 40.<sup>2</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 11.<sup>3</sup> Ps. cxxii. 6, 7.

us, and the tempestuous winds and waves of strife which rage about us, serve as a continual memento, that now we are sailing on a voyage, that we are still in the great deep, and have not arrived in the haven.

They therefore restrain us from fixing our affections on the transitory things about us; they wean us from this world and its perishable vanities, and make us look far beyond to the everlasting shore for which we are bound. They increase our Christian Hope; they remind us that a day *will* shortly come, when all the storms of strife will cease. *The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend*<sup>4</sup>. We long for that blessed time. Thus, the confusions, failings, and trials in the Church militant on earth excite us to raise our eyes to the future peace, order, beauty, and felicity of the Church glorified in heaven. Through the mists and clouds we see the clear blue sky, and the calm and joy of Angels, and the pure river of life, and the crystal sea, and the throne of God.

7. In conclusion.

True it is, my brethren, there are divisions around us: there are contentions within us; and these divisions are much to be deplored. It is the bounden duty of us all to *seek peace and ensue it*<sup>5</sup>; and as *much as in us lies to live peaceably with all men*<sup>6</sup>. *Behold how good and joyful a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity*<sup>7</sup>! But in this world we must not expect peace. Divisions there are and will be even to the end. If there were not heresies and strifes, the Gospel would not be true; for the Gospel foretels them. Let us not therefore be perplexed, or confounded, or dismayed by controversies: rather let us

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xiii. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. xxxiv. 14.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. xii. 18.

<sup>7</sup> Ps. cxxxiii. 1.

recognize in them a fulfilment of Christ's prophecies, and a proof of His truth; let us not therefore murmur; let us not be perplexed or cast down. *It is good for us to be here.* Let us remember that He Who has prophesied the prevalence of strife which we now see, has declared, also, that all strifes *will* one day *cease*, and the followers of peace will be rewarded for evermore. Let us therefore not repine that our lot is cast in an age of perturbations. Let us see in them the means and occasions of eternal good. The rain descends, and the floods come, and the winds blow, and beat upon our house: let us therefore take good heed that our house is built on a rock<sup>8</sup>. So, and so only, can it stand. Let us look well to our foundations: let us take good heed that they are laid strong and deep. Let them be built on the rock of God's Holy Word. Let us firmly be established and rooted in the persuasion that the Holy Scriptures contain the pure and entire Word of God; and that, *heaven and earth shall pass away, but that word shall not pass away*<sup>9</sup>. Having grounded ourselves on this solid and impregnable principle, let us satisfy our minds that what we ourselves believe, rests upon that Word; that it may be proved by most certain Warrant of Holy Scripture; and that it *has been* so proved by the Church of Christ, Which He has appointed to teach us His Word, with a divine promise that the *gates of Hell shall not prevail against her*, and He will be *with her always* even to the end<sup>1</sup>.

Thanks be to Almighty God, the Church of England is based on this foundation. She requires no new Creeds, no *new* Catechisms. She teaches publicly and authoritatively in her formularies all that the Ancient Universal Church ever taught. More than this She

<sup>8</sup> Matt. vii. 24.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. xxiv. 35.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xvi. 18. xxviii. 20.

dares not, less than it, She cannot teach. Here, then, you have true Unity; for you have Unity in the truth. Though strifes rage around us, though strifes rage within us, though some of her children, like the *false brethren* noted by St. Paul, may *speak perverse things*, though *there may be grievous wolves entering in among us, not sparing the flock*<sup>2</sup>, though some may endeavour to stifle her words, and others may attempt to persuade us that she utters *an uncertain sound*<sup>3</sup>, yet, if you listen to her Voice speaking in her Liturgy, her Articles, her Catechism, you may have, you will have peace. If you build on the Scriptures as she does, if you utter her Creeds, breathe her prayers, join in her Sacraments, you are united in the truth, for you are united in Christ and in God. Here you have *an anchor of the soul, sure and stedfast*<sup>4</sup>: hold to this, and no storms will disturb you. Rather, they will rivet your grasp. The winds of controversy will strengthen your faith, enliven your hope, and perfect your joy, and waft you to heaven. *You will not fear, though the earth be moved, and though the mountains shake at the tempest of the same. The rivers of the flood thereof shall make glad the City of God, the Holy Place of the Tabernacle of the most Highest*<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xx. 29, 30.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. vi. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. xlv. 2—4.





## SERMON II.<sup>1</sup>

---

ON PLEAS ALLEGED FOR SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH.

---

REV. ii. 18—20.

*Unto the Angel of the Church in Thyatira write ; These things saith the Son of God, . . . . I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works ; and the last to be more than the first. Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants.*

THE Apocalypse, or Book of Revelation of the Apostle and Evangelist St. John, is a divinely inspired Manual of Christian Faith and Practice for all Churches and Christians in all ages of the world. The language of the Holy Ghost to its readers is, “*Hear what THE SPIRIT saith unto the Churches*”<sup>2</sup>.

This declaration is specially applicable to the Epistolary addresses at the commencement of the book, in which the Holy Spirit, writing to the Seven Churches of Asia, dictates religious admonition to all Churches of Christendom.

These Epistles proceed from Christ, the Word of God, Who reveals what the Spirit says ; and they are

<sup>1</sup> Preached in Westminster Abbey, March 17, 1850.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. ii. 7. 11. 17. 29 ; iii. 6. 13. 22.

communicated through St. John, the chief Apostolic Pastor, to the Seven Angels, or Bishops, of the Churches in that portion of Asia of which Ephesus was the capital. In these Epistles, Our Lord recognizes St. John as the spiritual Head of this Asiatic Province; and He regards the Seven Angels, or Bishops, as the Representatives of their respective Churches, which are described as the Seven Golden Candlesticks, in *the midst of which the Son of Man walks*<sup>3</sup>. *And in His Right Hand are Seven Stars, which are the Angels of the Seven Churches*<sup>4</sup>.

All these Asiatic Churches were founded by Apostles; they were governed by Bishops, who had conversed with, and been consecrated by, Apostles; and they were under the pastoral care of the Beloved Disciple St. John.

And yet, be it observed, of these Churches, only two, Smyrna and Philadelphia, were in a sound state; none of the other five was free from the taint of some error of doctrine. St. John's own Ephesus had *left her first love*<sup>5</sup>. The Church of Pergamus tolerated those who held *the doctrine of Balaam*<sup>6</sup>. Sardis had *a name to live, but was dead*<sup>7</sup>. Laodicea was *neither hot nor cold*<sup>8</sup>. And of the Church of Thyatira it is said, *These things saith the Son of God. . . . I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a Prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants*<sup>9</sup>.

These facts, melancholy as they are, were written for our learning, and are of inestimable value. They shew to us Churches, planted and watered by the Blessed Apostles, and governed by Apostolic men, and

<sup>3</sup> Rev. i. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. i. 16. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. ii. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Rev. ii. 14.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. iii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Rev. iii. 15.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. ii. 18, 20.

yet overrun with the Tares of Heresy, even in the Apostolic age. But though thus infested with error, they are yet Churches. They are so called by Christ and the Holy Ghost. The sounder Churches are in communion with the unsound. The Apostle St. John is in communion with them all; they are all represented by Golden Candlesticks; Our Lord Himself communicates with them, He *walks in the midst of them*<sup>1</sup>; their Bishops are compared to Seven Stars which are in the Hand of Christ.

Hence we learn that, while it is necessary for us to communicate with such Churches as dispense the Word and Sacraments by means of such an Apostolic Ministry as is here recognized and approved by Christ Himself, we must not indulge in the illusory dream of finding a pure and spotless Church on earth; and that we must not separate ourselves from communion with an Apostolic Church, on account of failings and blemishes even in grave matters of doctrine, lest haply we should fall away from fellowship with the Holy Apostles, and, through our own fault, be plucked by the Evil One from the Hand of Christ<sup>2</sup>.

Let us now apply these considerations more closely to ourselves.

In two portions of this UNITED KINGDOM, (would to heaven, my brethren, that its condition corresponded to its name!) we behold already the lamentable effects of a prevalent religious division. In one<sup>3</sup> of them we see the bitter fruits of inveterate schism; in the other<sup>4</sup>, we have to deplore a more recent feud, which has rent that Kingdom asunder. These are solemn warnings to us. Let us view them calmly, let us not be carried away by violent passions, but let us sit humbly as

<sup>1</sup> Rev. i. 13.

<sup>2</sup> John x. 28, 29.

<sup>3</sup> Ireland.

<sup>4</sup> Scotland.

disciples at the feet of the *Prince of Peace*<sup>5</sup>; let us hear with attentive ears, what *the Spirit of Love saith unto the Churches*.

Among the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse there is one to which a special reference may now profitably be made, the Church of Thyatira. *To the Angel of the Church of Thyatira write, . . . I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest a Jezebel to teach.*

History does not inform us, what was the particular form of erroneous *doctrine*<sup>6</sup> propagated by the false Teacher of Thyatira, and tolerated by the Bishop of that Church. But clear it is, that it must have been very pernicious, inasmuch as it is here compared to the enormities of Jezebel, the idolatrous Patroness of Baal, and the cruel murderess of the true Prophets.

This Church of Thyatira appears to present a striking parallel to that position in which the CHURCH of ENGLAND is affirmed by some to be placed at the present juncture.

The allegations which they would bring against her may be stated thus:—

The doctrine of Baptism is confessedly one of the elementary rudiments and *first principles* of the oracles of God. It is so called in the Epistle to the Hebrews<sup>7</sup>. It is an Article of the Christian Faith, “I believe in One Baptism for the remission of sins.” But the fact is, that, at the present time, two different and conflicting opinions are taught in the Church of England, concerning this cardinal article of Christianity. This discrepancy, it is stated, is suffered by the Angels of the Church. And not only so, but when this solemn matter is referred to the Supreme Judicial Tribunal of

<sup>5</sup> Isa. ix. 6.

<sup>6</sup> It was error in *doctrine*, and not in *discipline*, or viciousness of *life*. See Rev. ii. 24. See also Vitringa ad locum, p. 105. ed. 1721.

<sup>7</sup> Heb. v. 12; vi. 1, 2.

the Church of England, it is there pronounced<sup>8</sup>, that the Church has *not* spoken clearly and definitely on this primary article of the Faith; or, in other words, that she has here left her members to be tossed about by different winds of doctrine, without any chart or compass to guide them in their course.

Such, it is alleged, is now the avowal of the Church herself.

The deductions derived by the same parties from these premises are as follows:

Christ has appointed His Church to be a faithful Witness of the truth. She is to be like a Golden Candlestick shining brightly to the world; she is to be the *salt of the earth*<sup>9</sup>; a *City set upon a hill*<sup>1</sup>; the *Pillar and the Ground of the Truth*<sup>2</sup>. It would appear, then, that the Church of England, by conniving at the teaching of two discordant doctrines on the Sacrament of Baptism, and by now declaring judicially that she has not uttered a clear and articulate sound on this solemn subject, has convicted herself of unfaithfulness to Christ, that she has forfeited her sacred commission, that her *salt has lost its savour*<sup>3</sup>, that she has quenched the light of her own Candlestick; and that her children must now look for guidance elsewhere, as the soldier looks for some other direction, when his Leader has laid down his arms, or, as the subject is discharged from his allegiance, when his Monarch abdicates the Throne.

In this statement of the case, I have endeavoured to exhibit fully, without reserve, its real or supposed difficulties. The well-known fact that they have occasioned much disquietude to many pious and thoughtful minds constrains the Minister of the Gospel to refer to them. Let us now proceed to examine them.

<sup>8</sup> On Friday, March 8, 1850.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. v. 13.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. v. 13.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 15.

The inquiry, you will perceive, before us is twofold.

I. What is the real nature of our present position?  
And,

II. Does it afford any plea for separation from the Church? or would such a separation be sin?

It cannot be denied, that two doctrines of an opposite character concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, are held by individual Ministers of the Church of England. It may indeed be justly questioned, whether the divergency of opinion between them would be found, on a calm and candid reviewal, to be so wide as some of their respective advocates seem to imagine. And, doubtless, much of the discrepancy would vanish, if the partizans, on either side, would endeavour, without passion or prejudice, to examine each other's opinions, and to state their own. But it cannot be denied, that any difference of teaching, on so vital a subject as this, is most deeply to be deplored. And, it is earnestly to be desired, that the Clergy and Laity would join in prayer to God to unite them in one heart and mind; and that they would attentively scrutinize the grounds of their difference with charity and meekness, and, with a hearty resolution, to submit their own private opinions to the Teaching of the Holy Spirit in Scripture, as interpreted by the Universal Church of Christ, which He hath promised to *guide into all truth*.<sup>4</sup>

And here it must not be forgotten, that, while this discrepancy of teaching is much to be lamented, there is great ground for thankfulness, and great reason for hope, in the important fact, that *all* the Ministers of the Church of England are *united* in receiving the same Scriptures, in professing the same Creeds, in subscribing the same Articles, in teaching the same

<sup>4</sup> John xvi. 13.

Catechism, in partaking of one Bread and drinking of one Cup in the Holy Communion<sup>5</sup>, and in using the same Liturgical Offices of Baptism and Confirmation.

Nor do we hear of *any wish* for *change* in this respect. Indeed, it cannot be doubted, that the recent Judicial decision has placed the Book of Common Prayer on a firmer basis than before. *Formerly*, a disposition was shown in certain quarters to mutilate it; but *now* all parties accept and maintain it. This, at least, is a great gain; it is an advance towards unity. And we shall be greatly wanting to ourselves and to the cause of unity and truth, if, by any ill-considered and intemperate measure, we forfeit this vantage-ground, and mar this benefit, and do not endeavour to avail ourselves of it quietly, patiently, and charitably, for the healing of divisions, and for the establishment of Truth and Peace.

The difference then, we see, is one, not of authorities, but of *construction and interpretation*. And such differences are the most easy to be remedied. The Prayer-book being the common recognized Standard of all, the course which all are bound in honesty to pursue, is, not to endeavour to wrest the Prayer-book to suit their own private opinions, but to conform their own private opinions to the Prayer-book.

Further; it must readily be allowed, that, when two parties maintain contradictory tenets, one of the two must be in error; and when the subject of those propositions is one of great religious importance, that error must be dangerous, and ought to be amended. Yet, it by no means follows, that the existence of such difference affords any ground for *separation from the Church*, in which these parties are contained. However grave the error in question may be, it cannot

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

be graver than that of which the false Teacher of Thyatira was guilty, who is compared to a Jezebel. Yet the Bishop of Thyatira suffered this Jezebel to teach; he is indeed reproved for so doing, but Church-Communion was not thereby broken. Thyatira is called a Church by the Holy Spirit. The sounder Churches of Asia did not sever themselves from it. St. John communicated with it; its Angel is called a Star in the Hand of Christ. Let us therefore not be staggered or dismayed, if our own Church should not be purer than the Churches of St. John; let us not be more rigid than he was; let us learn charity from Christ. Let us not communicate with heretics in their heresy, nor with schismatics in their schism; but let us not withdraw from an Apostolic Church, in which heretics or schismatics may exist. Let us patiently tolerate the bad for the sake of the good, and not sinfully desert the good on account of the bad<sup>6</sup>. In the Field of the Church there are, and ever will be, Tares mixed with the Wheat. Let us not antedate the Harvest. We cannot be reaped by the Angels unless we remain in the field; let us be *with* the Tares, but not *as* Tares; and when the Harvest shall arrive, we shall be gathered into the Garner of Christ.

III. But, it may perhaps be said, that these reasonings do not meet fully the difficulties of the case. The present objection is not only, that false Teachers exist in the Church. This, it will be conceded, is no just cause for separation. But the gravamen of the charge is, that the *Church herself* has no clear belief concerning the doctrine of Baptism; and that it has been pronounced by her highest Judicial Tribunal, that

<sup>6</sup> Elige potius fortis esse in tolerandis malis quàm impius in deserendis bonis.—*S. Aug. c. Parmen. i. 12.* Ne propter malos bonos deseramus sed propter bonos malos sufferamus.—*S. Aug. ibid. ii. 16.*



she has no definite and distinct teaching on this vital subject. She halts, it is said, *between two opinions*; and *she avows that she does so*. Thus, it is added, she virtually *owns herself disqualified to teach*; she has unchurched herself. It is not therefore fit and reasonable, that prudent and reflecting persons should commit themselves and their families to her guidance; they must retire from her, for *if the blind lead the blind, both must fall into the ditch*<sup>7</sup>.

What is to be said here?

Our reply is as follows:—

Whatever doctrine was contained in the pages of the Prayer-book *before* the recent Judgment was given, is contained there *now*. The Sovereigns of England declare that they are Supreme Governors of the Church of England, but Supreme, *under Christ*, and bound to govern according to His Law. They are *Defenders* of the Faith, and all the power which they possess is for *edification* and *not for destruction*<sup>8</sup>. They expressly disclaim any power to alter a single tittle or iota of the doctrines of the Church. They cannot give away what belongs to Christ.

These principles may be illustrated by reference to legal and civil affairs.

The English Law, with that wise spirit which characterizes it, in order to guard the Church from any damage in her spiritual inheritance, from the neglect, incompetence, indifference, or sinister intention of any of her Rulers, regards the Church as a Minor, in a state of tutelage; and the Supreme Ruler stands in the relation of a Guardian to her, who cannot commit waste in the estate of his Ward<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Matt. xv. 14.

<sup>8</sup> 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 10.

<sup>9</sup> *Ecclesia fungitur vice minoris . . . Coke Lit.* 341. *Ecclesia est infra aetatem et in custodiâ domini Regis qui tenetur jura ejus manutenere et defendere.* 11 *Co.* 49.

No default therefore or error on his part *can* prejudice her spiritual possession of sound Christian doctrine, which is, in every respect, inalienable and indefeasible.

This may be stated also in another light. The spiritual rights of the Church may be compared to the prerogatives of the Crown.

It was alleged by some Romish Divines at the Reformation, that the Kingdom of England had become subject to the See of Rome. And why? Because (they said) an English Sovereign, King John, had made a surrender of his Crown to the Roman Pontiff. England was therefore a fief of Rome.

But to this it was rightly answered, that Monarchs hold their Kingdoms to *govern*, and not to *give away*; that the King has no power to *alienate his regalities*; and that he *cannot* prejudice the rights of his Successors, and bring his realm and his people under subjection to a foreign Power. This reply is conclusive.

Let it now be applied to spiritual matters. The Crown cannot alienate its own rights; much less can it alienate the rights of the Church. It cannot alienate its own royalties; much less can it alienate the royalties of Christ.

The Rights of the Church, the Royalties of Christ, consist in the Sacred Deposit of the Christian Faith. The Church cannot surrender these; and no one can surrender them for her.

Claiming then to be a true Church, and to teach all that the Scriptures teach, the Church of England *must be supposed* to teach *the Truth* with respect to the Sacrament of Baptism. It *cannot be admitted* that she has no fixed opinion on this solemn subject.

No Christian Verity can be rightly regarded as an open question in the Church of England. If it is imagined that she has not spoken clearly in her

Book of Common Prayer concerning the doctrine of Baptism; and if (as the plainest things may be controverted,) a Controversy arises concerning her real meaning, then the solution is easy; she herself has furnished it. She refers us for further elucidation to a supplementary comment, which is to settle the controversy. She expressly provides for the exigency supposed. In one of her XXXIX Articles, the Twentieth, she declares that *the Church*, that is, the Church Universal<sup>1</sup>, *hath authority in Controversies of faith*.

Here, then, the question is at rest. Christ promised His Holy Spirit, to *guide the Church into all Truth*<sup>2</sup>. This promise would have failed, if the Church Universal had not taught the Truth with respect to Baptism. And if the Church Universal has taught the truth, the Church of England teaches it, for she refers to the Church Universal.

Now, let me appeal to all who have any knowledge of Christian Antiquity. Did the Church Universal, for fifteen hundred years after Christ, hold *two* different doctrines with respect to Baptism? Certainly not. She held but *one*<sup>3</sup>. And if that doctrine be not the true doctrine, then the promise of Christ to His Church was void. That *one* doctrine therefore is true; and therefore *it cannot be conceded* that the Church of England speaks ambiguously concerning Baptism. If she does, then we must refer to the Church Universal. What the Church Universal teaches, is taught by the Church of England; and therefore the doctrine of the Church of England is one, and it is true.

Still further.—Suppose, for argument's sake, that the

<sup>1</sup> "The Whole Church." See Bishop Beveridge on Art. XX. vol. ii. p. 122—125. Cf. Professor Blunt's University Sermons, Cambridge, 1850, pp. 90—98.

<sup>2</sup> John xvi. 13.

<sup>3</sup> See Bp. Bethell's valuable remarks in his Work on Regeneration, pp. 82, 92, 94, 97, 100, 223, *fifth ed.* 1850. .

Church of England is *made to appear* to speak ambiguously by representation, in a Judicial Court, on this subject. Suppose it to be there affirmed that she has given no directions to her children in this vital matter, and if through the suspension of her synodical functions, or from any other cause, she is precluded from clearing herself in an authoritative manner from such an imputation; if, alas! she be reduced to the same condition as that of her Divine Lord, Whose hands were bound, and His eyes blindfolded<sup>4</sup>, and if the soldiers of Rome laugh her to scorn, yet this condition of affairs, however distressing, would indeed suggest much matter for sorrow, but could afford *no plea for separation*. Rather, it ought to bind us more closely to her. The tears of a Mother ought to make us love her more; especially when that Mother is the Spouse of Christ.

Remember, my Brethren, the condition of the Church of Israel in the time of Christ. Then the Scribes and Pharisees were the Representatives of that Church—*They sat in Moses' Seat*. Our Lord put to them a question concerning Baptism<sup>5</sup>. *The Baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men? Answer Me*. The reply was, *We cannot tell*. So now, suppose the question put to the Representatives of our own Church, *The Baptism of Christ, does it convey grace, or does it not?* Suppose the reply to this question is, *We cannot tell*. What then? Should we be justified in deserting *the Church?* God forbid! What was the conduct of Christ? He did indeed reprove the Scribes and Pharisees. He called them *blind Guides*<sup>6</sup>. But though they would give Him no answer concerning the Baptism of John, and though they even made *the Word of*

<sup>4</sup> Mark xv. 1; xiv. 65. Luke xxii. 64.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xxi. 25—27. Mark xi. 33. Luke xx. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxiii. 16.

*God of none effect by their traditions*<sup>7</sup>, yet He did not quit the Church, He did not secede to Mount Gerizim, He erected no private Conventicle, He frequented the Worship of the Temple, and taught in the Chair of the Synagogue. Yes,—and He paid due homage to the office of the Scribes and Pharisees themselves. *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore that* (so sitting and teaching from the Law of Moses) *they bid you observe, that observe and do*<sup>8</sup>. But at the same time, He warned His Disciples against their *false doctrine: Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees, which is hypocrisy*<sup>9</sup>.

Christ, then, we see, my brethren, Whose Divine Eye saw all the secret faults, as well as the glaring corruptions, of the Jewish Church, and in Whose sight the heavens themselves are not clean, nor the angels pure<sup>1</sup>, yet did not scruple to communicate with that Church. Jerusalem was still *the Holy City*<sup>2</sup>; *salvation was of the Jews*<sup>3</sup>. And when that deed of darkness was accomplished, when the Son of God Himself was rejected, and by *wicked hands was crucified and slain*<sup>4</sup> by the Representatives of the Jewish Church, yet still, because of the Priesthood of God remaining in the Temple, and because of the Word of God preached in the Synagogues, the Apostles of Jesus Christ continued to communicate with it.

Let us hence learn a lesson of patience, wisdom, humility, and of love. Let us not affect to be more holy than our Blessed Lord and His Apostles. *Go, and do thou likewise.*

<sup>7</sup> Matt. xv. 6. Mark vii. 13. Prideaux's Connexion, 1. B. v. p. 95. Hottinger, Thesaur, p. 557.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. xxiii. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. xvi. 6. Luke xii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Job. xv. 15; iv. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. iv. 5; xxvii. 53.

<sup>3</sup> John iv. 22.

<sup>4</sup> Acts ii. 23.

## IV. Let us proceed a step further.

The recent Judicial Sentence, to which we have referred, is not the sentence of the Church in a regularly constituted Synod, and the competency of the Tribunal, by which it was pronounced, was publicly excepted against by the Chief Pastors of the Church<sup>5</sup>. But let us waive that point. Let us even imagine that it were the sentence of the Church of England in a National Ecclesiastical Council. Yet in that case it would afford *no plea for separation*.

The Church of England does not claim to be infallible. She asserts in her XIXth Article, that *the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, have erred*, not only in *matters of ceremonies*, but also in *matters of Faith*. And she does not arrogate to *herself* the privilege of inerrancy which she does not concede to them. But she never imagines that, because a Church may err,

<sup>5</sup> On Thursday, Feb. 5, 1850,—

The BISHOP of LONDON said, in moving the first reading of the *Clergy Proceedings Bill* in the House of Lords, "A Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was not a suitable or competent tribunal for questions involving decisions upon what was Heresy or False Doctrine. It was *not* a *Church Tribunal* . . . A clause in the Bill which he now introduced, provided a new Tribunal for Heresy, and had been framed after most careful deliberation by a Committee of their Lordships; and if Her Majesty would allow Convocation to assemble to take this point into consideration, it would create in the Church great satisfaction." His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY "expressed his concurrence in what had fallen from his Right Rev. friend the Bishop of London; and hoped that his proposition for a new Tribunal would meet with the support of their Lordships, and trusted that his Bill would be carried in the present Session. The present state of the law was acknowledged to be excessively defective, and he must say that it was chiefly owing to the defective constitution of the Court of Appeal that the Church stood in a position of some difficulty. It cannot be expected to be satisfactory to the public, that a Court by which cases of unsound doctrine are tried should consist wholly of laymen."

therefore its members may break the bands of Church unity. If this were the case, there would be no such thing as Church Communion in the world. A mother who errs is still a mother, and deserves respect as such. We may not participate in her errors, but her children cannot renounce their filial obligations to her.

The wisest and holiest Rulers of a Church may fall into error in grave matters of doctrine; and they may even proceed to ratify and publish their errors in venerable Synods of the Church. But this is no ground for separation. It is a reason why the sounder members of the Church should exercise patience, charity, and wisdom; and should endeavour to restore the erring portion of the Church to a right mind, and should labour with prayer to God for perfect unity in the truth.

This proposition may be aptly illustrated by a practical example.

In the middle of the third century<sup>6</sup> a controversy arose in the African Church concerning the Sacrament of Baptism. The question at issue was,—Whether Baptism administered with water, in the Name of the Holy Trinity, but administered by heretical Clergy, was valid Baptism, or no? St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, one of the holiest and wisest Prelates who ever adorned the Church, and who shed his blood in her cause, and the other Bishops of Africa assembled in Convocation with him, affirmed in Synodical Decrees, that all Baptism administered beyond the pale of the pure and sound Church<sup>7</sup> *is null and void*; and that every one who had been baptized in heresy ought to *receive* Baptism when he was reconciled to the unity of the True Church.

This doctrine was iterated<sup>8</sup> by the African Church in

<sup>6</sup> A.D. 253. See Euseb. H. E. vii. 3, 4, 5.

<sup>7</sup> S. Cyprian, Ep. 71.

<sup>8</sup> S. Cyprian. Ep. 70—73. S. Aug. de Bapt. c. trā Donatistas, ii. c. 7, and Libb. v. and vi. in Crescon. iii. c. 2. Routh Reliquiæ Sacræ, iii. 84—88.

successive Synods; one of which consisted of as many as seventy-one Bishops, and another of eighty-seven.

The same doctrine was promulgated also at the same time in the Asiatic Churches of Cappadocia, Galatia, and Cilicia<sup>9</sup>.

It cannot be doubted, that, by these Synodical Decrees, the Church of Africa committed herself to a very grave error, contravening the great truth of "One Baptism for the Remission of Sins."

Happily for the peace of the Church, St. Cyprian<sup>1</sup> and the Bishops with him, did *not impose* their *error on others as a term of communion*. They differed from others of sounder belief, but did not divide themselves from them by schism. Nor, on the other hand, did *wise and sober men*<sup>2</sup> separate themselves from St. Cyprian and the African Bishops on the ground of this false doctrine. On the contrary, they laboured patiently, quietly, and zealously, in maintaining and propagating the truth, and their labours were blessed with success. The truth *was* retrieved and established in a subsequent<sup>3</sup> plenary Council of the Church. In God's own time, the African Church, though under great disadvantage, as having to struggle against the well merited influence of the name of the holy Bishop of Carthage, cleared herself from the error<sup>4</sup>, to which

<sup>9</sup> S. Cyprian, Ep. 75. S. Aug. de Bapt. v. c. 25. Serm. xxxvii. If any one should imagine that St. Cyprian's error was only one of *discipline*, let him consult Hooker, E. P. iii. 1, 9. and V. lxii.

<sup>1</sup> S. Hieron. in Lucifer. c. 8. 9. Aug. de Bapt. ii. c. 8. iii. c. 3. v. 17. Serm. cccxvi. Vinc. Lirin. c. x. xi.

<sup>2</sup> Men of rash and intemperate minds (such as Stephanus Bp. of Rome), *did* separate themselves from Cyprian; and even excommunicated him. See S. Aug. de Bapt. i. c. 7. v. 25. Firmilian ap. S. Cypr. Ep. 75. Euseb. vii. c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> S. Aug. de Bapt. i. c. 7. ii. c. 9. S. Hieron. contrà Lucif. c. ix. cf. Concil. Arelat. can. viii.

<sup>4</sup> S. Hieron. in Lucif. c. 8. Some of the Asiatic Churches also revoked their error. S. Aug. in Crescon. iii. 2.



he and the Bishops with him had given dignity and weight ; and, as if to reward her for her patience, her charity, and her faith, God, in the next century, raised up in the African Church an Augustine, who by his eloquence, wisdom, learning, and piety, put to flight for ever that same error, when the Sect of the Donatists endeavoured to *impose* it as an *Article of Faith*.

Here was a glorious triumph of unity and truth. Let the Church of England profit by this example of the Church of Africa : and may she, by God's goodness, partake in her victory !

V. From what has now been said, it appears, my beloved brethren, that there is no just cause for separation from a Church, though evil Ministers may exist and be suffered to teach in it. This is clear from the case of the Church of Thyatira. Nor, again, is there any just cause for separation, when the voice of the Church is belied or stifled ; or if the Church herself be *made to appear* to say that she cannot tell what the truth is. This has been shown from the case of the Jewish Church, when under the rule of the Scribes and Pharisees. Nor is there any just cause for Schism, even though the Church herself, in a Synod of Bishops lawfully assembled, should promulgate an error on a grave question of doctrine. This has been made evident from considering the case of the African Church under St. Cyprian.

All these conditions of existence are deeply to be deplored. This cannot be denied. But they are the lot of the Church *on earth*. She is here in a mixed and an imperfect state. She is a Field<sup>5</sup> where Tares are mingled with the Wheat. She is a Threshing Floor where Chaff lies together with the Grain. She is a Vine with fruitful and unfruitful Branches. She

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xiii. 30 ; iii. 12 ; xxv. 32 ; xiii. 47, 48. John xv. 1. Gen. vi. 19. 1 Pet. iii. 20. Matt. x. 2—4.

is a Net where bad Fish are enclosed with good. She is the Ark in which the Father of Canaan is carried together with Shem and Japhet. She is the Apostolic Company in which there is a Judas as well as a Peter and a John. All these things are trials of her Faith, Hope, and Love; they remind her that she is *now* a pilgrim, a sojourner, and an exile; they make her prepare, and pray for, the time of *future* separation, when she will be cleansed from all taint and wrinkle, and presented in pure raiment, clean and white, a spotless Bride to Her Divine Lord <sup>6</sup>.

VI. But you may enquire now; Can there not be *any* just cause of separation from a Church? To which I reply, Of *Voluntary* separation, None<sup>7</sup>. Be assured that *wilful* Schism is a work of death; it is a mortal sin. No evil is so great, that this can be its remedy. A true Christian may often *suffer* evil, but he will never *commit* it. If the Church of which he is a member, not only falls into error, but proceeds to *impose* and *obtrude* that error upon him, as a Term of Communion, and as necessary to everlasting Salvation, *then* he cannot communicate with the Church in that error, but his separation is *not voluntary*; and the sin of the Schism does not rest with him, but with the party obtruding the term of communion upon him.

This is the true account of the English Reformation. We did indeed renounce and forsake the errors of Rome. But the separation which has taken place between us and her, has arisen from her *imposition of those errors as Terms of Communion with her*. She propounds in her Creed certain heresies, contrary to Scripture and to the doctrine of the primitive Church. She affirms in that Creed that there are Seven Sacra-

<sup>6</sup> Rev. xix. 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Non est gravius quidquam sacrilegio schismatis, quia præcidendæ unitatis nulla est justa necessitas.*—S. Aug. c. Ep. Parmen. ii. 25.

ments neither more nor less ; She there also asserts the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and of Purgatory, and of Invocation of Saints, and of Worship of Images ; and that the Church of Rome is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches. And She concludes that Creed with an absolute and universal Anathema against all who do not and cannot receive these erroneous dogmas.

*This, she says, is the true Catholic Faith, out of which no man can be saved.* Thus she makes communion in her *errors* essential to communion with *herself*<sup>8</sup>.

Here is the stress of the matter ; here is the cause of separation ; and till these denunciations be revoked, she will continue to be the *author* of the great Schism which rends Christendom asunder.

It is for want of due consideration of these important principles that so many persons have fallen into Schism, as if it were a light thing to rend the Robe of Christ. Nothing profiteth, says St. Paul<sup>9</sup>, without charity. And no one can be said to follow charity, who does not love the Unity of the Church.

But here it may perhaps be said, that the recent Judicial Sentence *does* amount to the imposition of a sinful term of Communion ; and so gives rise to the emergency, just specified, which necessitates separation.

If a person, it is said, duly qualified in other respects, but professing erroneous doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Baptism (I do not here enter into the question, on which side the error lies?), comes before a Bishop for Institution, that is for admission to the *cure of souls*<sup>10</sup>, the Bishop is required by law to

<sup>8</sup> Libri Symbolici Ecclesiæ Rom. p. xlviii. p. 100. This Creed was published A.D. 1564 by Pope Pius IV. ; but many of these Articles had been imposed as terms of communion by the Church of Rome before that date.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

<sup>10</sup> " Instituo te rectorem Ecclesiæ parochialis de C. et habere  
E 2

institute, and so, by this act of Institution, becomes a party to the teaching of false doctrine. Hence therefore it is argued that false doctrine is hereby made a term of communion.

To this it may be replied first, that Terms of Communion cannot involve contradictions: and that matters left indifferent cannot be regarded as Terms of Communion. If then, the doctrine of the efficacy of Baptism is, as it is called, an open question, it is not a Term of Communion. "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments" is our Term of Communion. Every one who ministers in the Church<sup>11</sup>, must "publicly declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in it," and if any deprave its sense, or wrest it from its natural meaning, he is guilty of a heinous sin in the sight of God.

And further, when it is said that the Bishop is called upon *by law* to institute, it is clear that this matter concerns the *civil* relation, and not the *spiritual essence*, of the Church. A person may be *commanded* to do what in his conscience he believes to be sinful in the sight of God; but he *cannot* be *compelled* to do it<sup>1</sup>. He must obey God rather than man; and commit the cause to God. And if, in the case supposed, he cannot comply with the civil command, he is not liable to any spiritual censure from the *Church*. Therefore the spiritual character of the Church is not here concerned. If, notwithstanding his conscientious repugnance, and earnest endeavours to the contrary, a false teacher is in-

*curam animarum, et accipe curam tuam et meam.*"—See Phillimore's *Eccl. Law*, i. p. 167.

<sup>11</sup> 13 and 14 Car. II. c. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Sanderson Prælect ii. c. xvii. *Propositis duobus malis, altero poenæ altero culpæ, eligendum est malum poenæ, quia e duobus minus est malum pati malum quàm facere. Fieri non potest ut aliquis in eas angustias redigatur ut ei necessariò sit peccandum.*

truded into his diocese, he does not<sup>2</sup> communicate with him in his heresy, though he does communicate with him as far as he holds the truth; he is not amenable to the reproof, *Thou sufferest a Jezebel to teach and to seduce my servants*; he endures wrong, but does not commit it; *the offence does not come from him*. And if another Bishop judges fit to give Institution, there is no just cause for separation, any more than there was for severance from the Church and Bishop of Thyatira, with whom, as we know, St. John communicated.

VII. In the last place, let us ever remember, that God is the Ruler of the world; and Christ is the Head of the Church; and that the present trial has come upon our Church and Country not without a providential dispensation. Accordingly as we use it, so will it prove to us the occasion either of great evil, or of great good. In certain respects we may even now see in it a ground for thankfulness. As we have already said, it rivets us, both Clergy and Laity, more closely to the intelligent use of one of the most pure and devotional forms of public Liturgy, that ever was composed by the hands of men, I mean the Book of Common Prayer. Let us not be wanting to that Book, and that Book will not be wanting to us. It will prepare us, by sound doctrine, and by holy Offices of Prayer and Praise in the Church on Earth, to worship God for evermore with Saints and Angels in Heaven.

Next, there is ground for gratitude in the fact, that a violent rent has not taken place in the Church. However we may regret, that the Church should be publicly and solemnly *said* to have spoken ambiguously on the Sacrament of Baptism, yet, we cannot conceal from

<sup>2</sup> S. August. Epist. cv. 16. Quos corrigere non valemus, etiam si necessitas cogit ut pro salute cæterorum Dei sacramenta nobiscum communicent, *peccatis* tamen eorum non communicemus (1 Tim. v. 22) quod non fit nisi *consentiendo et favendo*.

ourselves that, for many years, too little pains has been taken by those who have been commissioned to teach, and to superintend the teaching of others, to inculcate clear, sound, and uniform doctrine, on that solemn subject. Hence discrepancy and error have prevailed.

We now see the consequence of *our own* culpable neglect. Let us not censure others, but ourselves. Let us repent, and amend our practice. Let us not be angry with the *symptoms*, but endeavour to eradicate the *disease*.

If it had been judicially determined on the recent occasion to which we have referred, that all persons holding erroneous opinions concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, are thereby disqualified from exercising any ministerial function in the Church of England, and that therefore such of the Clergy who hold these opinions must either be ejected, or ought to retire from their cures, those parties would have had grave cause for complaint; not indeed against a judgment which declared that maintenance of the true doctrine concerning Baptism is essential to the right exercise of the Christian Ministry; but that they had been taken by surprise, that this announcement had come upon them like a thunderclap, and that they had been long allowed to hold, without molestation or warning, a doctrine which it now appeared was so erroneous and pernicious as to be inconsistent with the honest retention of their office.

Every reasonable man, and, especially, every sincere lover of truth and peace, must rejoice, that no such violent extrusion, deprivation, or secession has taken place. Believing, as he does, that the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is true; believing that it is taught in Holy Scripture; remembering that it was the Doctrine of the whole Christian Church from the time of the Apostles for at least fifteen centuries; being firmly convinced that it *is* the Doctrine of the Church of England; and knowing that it is held by the

far greater number, and by the most intelligent of her Members; he cannot allow himself to doubt, that, (if our present position be not damaged by our own precipitation and violence) this doctrine, not as exaggerated and caricatured by the Church of Rome, which has made men shrink and recoil from the truth, by the garb in which she has dressed it, but clearly stated and rightly understood, will, ere long, be universally received. Here he sees now the prospect of a glorious victory. He cannot but rejoice and be thankful unto God, that a rupture has not been caused, which would have rendered such a reception of the Truth difficult, if not impossible. He will bear in mind, that the exercise of Church Discipline is *not* an easy thing; that there *are* times, when from the inveteracy or prevalence of error, or from the probability of a schism<sup>3</sup>, it must be administered with great tenderness and delicacy, and when a violent remedy would be far worse than the disease. He well knows that the only safe measures, in such critical cases, are gentle ones; he will not therefore hope for sudden health, but for gradual convalescence.

He will regard those who hold a different doctrine from himself as brethren; he will remember, that it is not *every* error, even in a grave matter, which constitutes *heresy*<sup>4</sup>; but that it is error wilfully adopted, publicly avowed and propagated, and obstinately and pertinaciously maintained, after repeated admonition and warning from Ecclesiastical Superiors, which makes a man a *heretic*<sup>5</sup>. He will recollect that it cannot be said that this is

<sup>3</sup> S. Aug. c. Parmen. ii. 25. Sibi nequaquam spiritualiter nocituros malos tolerant boni, ne spiritualiter sejungantur a bonis, cum disciplinæ severitatem consideratio custodiendæ pacis refrenat aut differt, quam tamen securitas *exerit* cum apparet sine vulnere schismatis ad salubrem correctionem posse aliquid ecclesiastico Judicio vindicari. See also *ibid.* iii. 2. 13—15. 27, 28.

<sup>4</sup> See S. Aug. Ep. xliii.

<sup>5</sup> It would seem that the true solution of the difficulty in the

the case with them; he will recollect that they join with him in the same Scriptures, the same Creeds, the same Catechism, the same Articles, the same Liturgy, the same Eucharist; and he will humbly pray, and earnestly labour, and confidently hope, that they may be fully and finally united with him in this point also, as beloved brethren in Christ; and that they and he may stand together hereafter with Harps in their Hands, to sing the Praise of Christ at *the crystal Sea*, the *heavenly* type of Baptism<sup>6</sup>, which is before *the Throne of God*<sup>7</sup>.

*Let us pray*<sup>8</sup>.

O GOD the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all; so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee, through JESUS CHRIST our Lord. *Amen.*

recent perplexing case, was to be found in a strict theological definition of *Heresy*. As long as the error of a *Presbyter* is connived at or encouraged by any Spiritual Superiors, it may be doubted whether that error can be said to amount to *formal Heresy*, and as such to disqualify him from continuing to minister in a Church, where they bear rule . . . But the CHURCH should not be made the victim of his error, and their sufferance of it. *She* should not be said to have spoken ambiguously, because those who bear office in her communion have failed in their duty to her.

<sup>6</sup> See Bede ad loc.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. iv. 6; xv. 2, 3.

<sup>8</sup> Prayer for Unity; from a Form of Prayer on the Queen's Accession.



## SERMON III.

---

ON THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM ; WITH REFERENCE TO  
THE OPINION OF PREVENIENT GRACE.

---

ROM. vi. 3, 4.

*Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death ? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death : that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*

THE great Festivals of the Church exhibit to us a lively picture of our privileges and duties. Upon this Day <sup>1</sup>, when we commemorate the glorious event of our Lord's Resurrection, we behold the cause of our own Justification ; we see the instrument of our own deliverance from the death of sin, and we acknowledge our consequent obligation to walk in newness of life. Our spiritual life has its source in the mercy of God vouchsafed to us in Jesus Christ. That mercy applies itself actually to quicken our souls in the Sacrament of Baptism, wherein we receive the first effusion of that Spiritual Grace, which, by virtue of Christ's Incarna-

<sup>1</sup> This sermon was preached in Westminster Abbey on Easter Day (March 31), 1850.

tion, and His consequent capacity of suffering in our nature for our sakes, and of the union of our nature to the nature of God, delivers us from the power of Satan, and from the punishment of sin, and raises us to a new life, which, if cherished and fostered by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, blessing our continual use of other successive and continuous means of grace, will not fail to convey us safe through the grave and gate of death to our glorious Resurrection, and consign us to a blessed Immortality, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

This statement of the true Faith, as revealed in Holy Scripture, has been controverted in recent times; and the very existence of doubts and differences on this important subject presents a fit occasion, — indeed creates a necessity — for the vindication and manifestation of the Truth.

Some benefit, by God's mercy, has ever been reaped by the Church, from the propagation of strange doctrines. Those, who love the truth, have thereby been excited to search more diligently into the divine Oracles, and thus have been enabled to profess the sound Faith with clearer intelligence, and to maintain it with greater faithfulness, steadfastness, and courage.

The dissemination of pernicious doctrines in the Third and Fourth Centuries of the Christian era, concerning the Deity of Christ, led to fuller and firmer assertions of that cardinal doctrine; and the Creeds of the Church, which condemned the Arian and Nestorian heresies, and others of no less magnitude, remain now like solid and impregnable bulwarks of the Faith; and thus the assaults of the Tempter have served, under God's providence, to strengthen the foundations of the Church.

Thus also, when it pleased God to pour out His Spirit on the Church in the beginning of the Sixteenth

Century, it was not only by the teaching of the truth, but even through the dissemination of error, that her faith was confirmed and manifested. The false notions of the Zwinglian<sup>2</sup>, which degraded the Christian Sacraments to mere professions of faith and outward badges of union, and the errors of the Calvinist who divorced the sign from the thing signified<sup>3</sup>, and the novel tenets of the Anabaptist which denied the general necessity of Baptism, and rejected the Baptism of Infants, rendered the Church more vigilant, zealous, and energetic in defending and maintaining the Truth, in this cardinal Article of the Faith<sup>4</sup>.

In like manner, it cannot reasonably be doubted, that the Controversy, which has agitated and still agitates the CHURCH of ENGLAND, with respect to the SACRAMENT of BAPTISM, has led many, and will lead many more, by God's grace, to examine more carefully into the foundations of their Christian Life; to enquire more diligently into the origin of their Christian Hope; and to ponder, with grateful hearts, and with godly fear, on the high privileges to which they were admitted, and on the solemn duties to which they were pledged, when they were engrafted in the mystical Body of Christ, at their Baptism.

If, also, this solemn argument be handled in a spirit of meekness; if the voice of anger and clamour and

<sup>2</sup> See Zwinglii Opera, xi. p. 197.

<sup>3</sup> Calvin, Inst. IV. xiv. § 17. Spiritus Sanctus, quem non omnibus promiscue sacramenta advehunt sed *quem peculiariter suis confert Deus*, i. e. to the Elect, or Predestinate, irrespectively of Sacraments.

<sup>4</sup> The Romish writer Moehler acknowledges the benefits derived by the Lutherans from their controversies with the School of Zwingle (who died A.D. 1531). Symbolism, iv. § 28, p. 294. No doubt Luther's Catechismus Major (A.D. 1529, Pars iv.), and the Article xiii. of the Augsburg Confession (A.D. 1530), and the Apology vii. (A.D. 1531), are directed against the Zwinglians as well as Anabaptists.

evil-speaking be far removed from it; if it be treated with that holy reverence which alone befits so sacred a subject, and with that temper of sobriety, gentleness, and love, which befits a matter in which the interests of immortal souls are concerned,—then we may be permitted to cherish the joyful hope, not only that the arts of the Evil One, who has raised this controversy among us, will be foiled and frustrated, but that great *good* will be elicited from them; that our divisions will be healed, and peace prevail, and all be united together in the acknowledgment of the truth in Christ.

For the attainment of these results, let us bear in mind that, under the good Providence of Almighty God, which has never ceased to watch over the CHURCH of ENGLAND, our main hope rests on the piety, patience, wisdom, and charity of the whole body of her Clergy and People. Let our maxim be—*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good*<sup>5</sup>. *Continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel*<sup>6</sup>.

It seems to be desired by many excellent persons, at the present time, that the CHURCH of ENGLAND should put forth, in a Synodical Assembly, some authoritative Declaration of her Faith concerning the Sacrament of Baptism.

But such a manifestation as that would appear to be liable to grave objections. It may well be doubted whether such an act of her friends would not be welcomed with great exultation by her enemies, as tantamount to an *admission*, on her part, that she has *hitherto spoken ambiguously* on this primary and fundamental article of the Christian Faith. If now, in the middle of the nineteenth century, she were to promulgate such

<sup>5</sup> 1 Thess. v. 21.

<sup>6</sup> Col. i. 23.

a profession, how would they triumph in this avowal from her, that she had left her children in uncertainty for so many hundred years, with regard to the Elements of Christianity !

May Heaven preserve her from so dangerous and humiliating an act of such self-abnegation as that !

Let us be assured, my brethren, that the Church of England *has* declared herself fully on this doctrine. More fully she could not speak than she has already spoken : and she affirms that she has spoken clearly<sup>7</sup>. And if she were now to explain anew what she has already promulgated so clearly, she would only weaken the force of her former testimony by such an iteration. We must never allow that she has spoken obscurely : much less must we *act* on the supposition that she has done so. If we do, we wrong her and ourselves. Let us not misrepresent her, by asking her to explain. Let us not spend our time, like the Athenians, in either hearing, or telling *some new thing*<sup>8</sup>. But let us be content

<sup>7</sup> The CHURCH of ENGLAND has expressly repudiated by anticipation, all imputation of ambiguity in her Liturgical offices, by saying, as she does in *every edition* of her Prayer Book printed at the period of the Reformation, Herein “is ordained *nothing* to be read but the very pure Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is *evidently* grounded upon the same ; and that in such a language and order as is *most easy and plain for the understanding both of readers and hearers*.”—(Introduction to the Book of Common Prayer, “Concerning the Service of the Church ;” ed. 1549, 1552, 1559.)—Hence Bishop RIDLEY says, that “this Church of England had the true and wholesome Administration of Christ’s Holy Sacraments, the *whole profession* of Christ’s Holy Religion *truly set forth in Baptism*, the *plain declaration* of the same taught in the Holy Catechism, to be learned of all true Christians.”—Eccl. Biog. iii. p. 83, ed. 1839. And the LVIIth CANON says : “The DOCTRINE of BAPTISM . . . is so sufficiently set down in the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, to be used at the Administration of the said Sacrament, that *nothing can be added unto it*, that is material or necessary.” See also above, Sermon II. pp. 28, 29.

<sup>8</sup> Acts xvii. 21.

with what is old. Let us hold that fast. Let us maintain, that what we need now, is, not that our *Mother* the Church should speak again concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, but that we, her *children*, should listen more attentively to what she has already spoken so clearly. She has not been wanting in her duty to us; but we have been much wanting in our duty to her. And now that, unhappily, her words have been *said* to be ambiguous (not through any fault on her part, but through the personal defects of her Ministers and People), it is our duty to make her amends by hearing and understanding her voice. And if we show by our words and deeds that we do indeed understand her, then, we may rest assured, that this charge of ambiguity will soon fall idly to the ground.

With such sentiments as these let us approach the consideration of this subject, propounded to us by the Apostle, in the Second Lesson of this Day: *Know ye not, that so many of us as were Baptized into Jesus Christ, were Baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*

Here, first, let us call to mind the true nature of the Christian SACRAMENTS.

It is very erroneous to imagine, that Sacraments are mere outward Signs or Pictures of inward spiritual gifts. This, indeed, they are, but they are much more. They are also more than Memorials of God's past mercy; they are also more than Pledges of His present love, and Earnests of His future favour. They are more than acts of Obedience which Christ requires from all. They are also more than visible Tokens and federal Symbols by which the Members of Christ are distinguished from all who do *not* adore Him, and by which they declare their love for each other and for

Him, and by which they, as His members, edify one another, and strengthen the unity of the Body by dwelling in Him. Sacraments are, indeed, very beneficial and necessary for these important ends; but, they have also *another* purpose. They are visible Marks, showing to us *when* we receive God's Grace; and they are the divinely appointed and effectual Means for conveying that Grace to all who receive them worthily.

So much for Sacraments generally.

II. To speak now specially of BAPTISM.

By nature, as men, we all proceed from Adam. We were all contained in him, as the waters of a stream are contained in its source. And *Adam was first formed, then Eve*<sup>9</sup>. Adam was taken from the ground; but Eve, his wife, was not taken from the earth, but from the side of Adam as he slept; and when he awoke from his sleep, he said, *This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh, she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man*. And she was also called Eve, because she was the *Mother of all living*<sup>1</sup>. Thus, *derivatively*, we all are from Adam and Eve; but, *originally*, we are all from Adam; and Adam himself from the earth.

All these things, as St. Paul teaches, have a spiritual meaning. Adam is the type of Christ, Who is therefore called the *Second Adam*. *The first man is of the earth, earthy; the Second Man is the Lord from heaven*<sup>2</sup>. *The first man, Adam, was a living soul, the Second was a quickening Spirit*<sup>3</sup>, and as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive<sup>4</sup>.

Let us observe now, how this spiritual revivification is effected. The source of our *natural* life was in

<sup>9</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Gen. i. 22, and ii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 47.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 45.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 22.

Adam in Paradise; the source of our Spiritual Life was in Christ on Calvary. Adam slept in the garden; Christ slumbered on the Cross. The side of Adam was opened, and thence Eve was formed, *the Mother of all living*. The side of Christ was pierced, and *there-out came forth Blood and Water*<sup>5</sup>, the figures of the Christian Sacraments. And the *Spiritual Eve*, the Church, the Spouse of Christ, *the Mother of all living*<sup>6</sup>, derives her life and health from those Sacramental Streams which flow from the wounded and bleeding side of her Divine Lord. The Sacraments are visible proofs and perpetual memorials of the Death of Christ, and receive their efficacy from it, and apply its vivifying virtues to all faithful receivers. Hence it is, that all Christians, by means of the Sacraments, are children derivatively of Christ and His Church, and originally of Christ Himself; and thus, while they have their *natural* life from the first Adam, *who is of the earth, earthy*; they derive their *spiritual* life from the Second Adam, *Who is the Lord from heaven*.

This, in brief, is the true faith concerning the Sacrament of BAPTISM; and hence such glowing language is used concerning it in Holy Scripture. How otherwise could it be said, that *Except a man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*<sup>7</sup>? How otherwise could we hear that, *As many of you as have been Baptized into Christ have put on Christ*<sup>8</sup>. How otherwise could you be taught that *Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God*<sup>9</sup>. *By One Spirit are we all*

<sup>5</sup> John xix. 34, cf. 1 John v. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Eph. v. 22—33. Rev. xx. 2. 9.

<sup>7</sup> John iii. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 11.



*Baptized into One Body, the Church, which is the Spouse and Body of Christ*<sup>1</sup>. *Now ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular*<sup>2</sup>. *There is One Body and One Spirit, there is One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism*<sup>3</sup>. How could we ever comprehend such heavenly language as this, except by remembering that Baptism was instituted by Christ, and receives its efficacy from the sacrifice of Christ, perfect God and perfect Man, joining our nature to the Divine<sup>4</sup>, conveying to us a sovereign remedy for the corruption we inherit from Adam, by the imputation to us of His own Righteousness, and by the infusion in us of His own Spirit, and by the shedding for us of His own precious Blood, and so reconciling us to the Father, Who manifested His acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, and thus proclaimed our Justification, by raising Christ from the Dead. Thus also God, regarding us as implanted in the Body of Christ, looks upon us as restored to life in Him, and He loves us as His own children by adoption in Christ, and *joint heirs* with Him<sup>5</sup>, candidates for exaltation to that blessed place *whither* our Head and Saviour *Jesus*

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 13. Ephes. i. 22, 23.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Ephes. iv. 4, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Hence Bp. ANDREWES (Serm. IX. on the Nativity, p. 81, ed. 1635) says: "This was the chief end of Christ being *with us*" (our Emmanuel), "to give us a capacity to *be made the Sons of God* (John i. 12), by being born again of Water and the Spirit."

"The same original that Christ took in the womb of the Virgin to us-ward, the same hath He placed for us in the fountain of Baptism to God-ward."

"Well therefore" (is Baptism) "called the womb of the Church (*σύντομον*, to the Virgin's womb), with a power given it to conceive and bring forth children to God. So His being conceived and born the Son of Man, doth conceive and bring forth our being born the Sons of God. His Participation of our human Nature" (produces) "our Participation of His Divine Nature."

<sup>5</sup> Rom. viii. 15—17.

*Christ is gone before ; and for a blessed partnership in His glorious Immortality.*

Hence the Apostle thus speaks, *In Christ we have Redemption, through His Blood, Who is the Image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature ; and He is the Head of the Body, the Church, and is the Beginning, the First-born from the dead. For it pleased the Father having made peace through the Blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things to Himself. And you hath He now reconciled in the Body of His Flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable if ye continue in the Faith*<sup>6</sup>. *As ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving, for ye are complete in Him, being buried with Him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through faith*<sup>7</sup>. *Know ye not that so many of us as were Baptized into Christ were Baptized into His death. Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life ; for if we have been planted together in the likeness of His Death, we shall be also in the likeness of His Resurrection*<sup>8</sup>.

Thus, we see, that our deliverance from death, and the source of our life, is in Christ ; that the ground of our hope of glory is in Him and in His death : and that this remission of sins and spiritual life is first conveyed to us, and this hope sealed to us, in the Holy Sacrament of Baptism.

III. This doctrine, clear though it be, and preached by the language of Inspiration in Holy Scripture, and witnessed by the unanimous voice, and embodied in the uniform practice, of the Church from the time of the Apostles for fifteen hundred years, yet, (wonderful to

<sup>6</sup> Col. i. 14—23.

<sup>7</sup> Col. ii. 7—12.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. vi. 3—5.

say,) has appeared to some persons to be involved in difficulty and perplexity, when applied to the case of Infants; and *other* theories have been devised and propounded in lieu of it, in reference to their case.

Deeply is it to be deplored that a discrepancy of teaching should exist on this fundamental article of Christian doctrine. Yet it cannot but be matter of satisfaction that the difference should be clearly brought to light. The arguments on both sides of the question being placed before us, may now be weighed in the balance of Reason and Scripture. And a confident hope may be entertained that, if the examination be conducted carefully, calmly, and candidly, the cause of Truth will greatly gain thereby, and that it will be seen and acknowledged by all, that, with regard to Baptism of Infants, there is but *one* Theory which is *not* beset with innumerable contradictions; and that this Theory is the Theory of the Church Universal, and of the Church of England.

Let us then proceed to examine the doctrine which has recently been put forth concerning Infant Baptism; and which may be called the theory of *Prevenient Grace*.

This Theory is as follows: and I shall take care to exhibit it faithfully in the words of the authentic document in which it is propounded<sup>9</sup>.

“The worthy reception of Sacraments, (it is there said,) is essential to their becoming effectual signs of grace<sup>1</sup>.” “And where there is no worthy reception, there is no bestowment of grace<sup>2</sup>.” “No spiritual grace is conveyed in Baptism, except to worthy recipients,” and

<sup>9</sup> Examination before admission to a Benefice, &c., respecting the Efficacy of Baptism. Edited by the Clerk examined, GEORGE CORNELIUS GORHAM, B.D. London: Hatchard. 1848. 8vo. pp. 230.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 69.

“Infants,” it is said, “are by nature unworthy recipients, being born in sin, and the children of wrath.” “And, therefore,” it is added as a conclusion, “Infants cannot receive any benefits from Baptism, except there shall have been a *prevenient*” (or antecedent) “act of grace to make them worthy<sup>3</sup>.”

This is carried still further in p. 113: “That filial state,” (the being made children of God by adoption,) “though clearly to be ascribed to God was given to the worthy recipient *before* Baptism, and not *in* Baptism.”

Such, my brethren, is the language in which this theory has been recently promulgated.

IV. Let us now see how it is applied to the case of baptized children *dying* in their infancy. Concerning such children our Church expressly declares, in the Rubric at the conclusion of her Office for Public Baptism, That “it is certain by God’s Word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.”

Now, if Infants, being children of wrath, are unworthy recipients of Baptism, and if, as cannot be doubted, (and as our Church teaches, Art. XXV.) “Sacraments have a wholesome effect only on such persons as receive them worthily,” how is it that these baptized children, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved? To this question it is replied, in the theory to which I am referring, that all children, who die in their Infancy after they have been baptized, “must have been regenerated by an act of grace *prevenient* to their Baptism, in order to make them worthy recipients of that Sacrament<sup>4</sup>.”

But of *other* baptized children, who grow up, it is said in the same Volume, that “Regeneration in Baptism may not have taken place, and is therefore to be implored

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp. 83. 85. Also pp. 90. 123. 125.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 85.

in after years<sup>5</sup>,” and it is left uncertain in their case, whether the gift of Regeneration is dispensed to them “in Baptism, at Baptism, or after it<sup>6</sup>.” But the “filial state” of spiritual adoption is not “to be ascribed to Baptism,” and it is not *given* “in Baptism<sup>7</sup>.”

You can hardly have failed to observe, that this Theory is opposed to Reason and Charity, and at variance with Scripture and the Church, which uses these plain words, “Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this Child is *by* Baptism regenerate<sup>8</sup>.”

Suppose, now, the case of a baptized Infant, and suppose it falls sick. It either recovers, or dies. If it should die, then, according to this Theory, the Parent may rest assured that “it has received prevenient grace.” But if it should recover, then he has no such assurance; but he must remain in uncertainty, whether this same Child has received any such prevenient grace or no.

Let us now ask, Can there be any thing in the Infant’s *death* to render the Parent certain that his Child has received prevenient grace? And can there be any thing in the Child’s *recovery* to make him uncertain whether it has received it? Assuredly not. Regeneration cannot be made certain by Death, nor Reprobation made probable by Recovery.

Nor is this the whole of the difficulty. According to this Theory, the Child would have been saved if it had died; but now, having recovered, it may have received the Sacrament of Baptism *unworthily*, for lack of prevenient grace. And since (by our XXVth Article) all who receive the Sacraments unworthily derive no wholesome effect therefrom, “but purchase to themselves damnation,” therefore, according to this Theory,

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 74.

<sup>7</sup> See p. 113.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. pp. xxvi. xxvii. pp. 70, 71. 73.

<sup>8</sup> Office for Private Baptism.

the Infant, which would undoubtedly have been saved, if it had died, has become liable to damnation, now that it has recovered.

Surely, if this were the case, no Parent could ever wish his Child to recover from its sickness. Must he not rather earnestly beseech God, that it may die ?

As far as I can judge, no difficulty can be imagined so great, that this Theory can be its solution. It is a Theory which would reduce the Christian Sacraments to mere accidents. With reverence be it said, it would degrade the means of grace into games of chance. The blessed Apostle St. Paul teaches us *that all who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ*<sup>9</sup>, that is, have been arrayed in the Robe of His Righteousness: but this Theory would be a practical fulfilment of that dark and awful prophecy, *They parted my garments among them, and upon My Vesture they did cast lots*<sup>10</sup>.

V. Still further. This Theory is attended with another difficulty no less startling than the former. It alleges, as we have seen, that Infants, being by nature Children of wrath, *cannot receive Baptism worthily*, and that, since Sacraments are effectual *only to worthy recipients*, therefore, no benefit is conveyed in Baptism to any Infant, who has not been qualified to receive it worthily by some prevenient grace: that is, by some grace given antecedently to its Baptism.

It is sufficiently obvious, that this Theory would by no means remove the difficulty (if any difficulty there were), in believing that Infants born in sin may yet receive Baptism worthily, and do in fact so receive it, when Baptism is rightly administered.

No: this Theory would not obviate that difficulty, it would only shift it back a step. For, if *Infants*

<sup>9</sup> Gal. iii. 27.

<sup>10</sup> Ps. xxii. 18. Matt. xxvii. 35.

are not qualified to receive *Baptismal* Grace, how can they be qualified to receive *Prevenient* grace? If the fact of their being born in sin disables them for the one, it equally incapacitates them for the other. This supposed *Prevenient* grace would therefore require some *other* *Prevenient* grace; and so you would be driven back by a series of successive links, which have their beginning you know not where,—but certainly not in the Hand of God.

Let us remember also, that we have God's solemn promise for *Baptismal* Grace, *They that are baptized into Christ have put on Christ. We are all baptized by One Spirit into One Body. According to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*<sup>1</sup>. *Baptism also doth now save us by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*<sup>2</sup>. But we have no such promise for *Prevenient* grace. *Baptismal* Grace is of Divine institution: *Prevenient* grace is a human invention. Therefore, to abandon *Baptismal* Grace for *Prevenient* grace, would be to prefer the Abanas and Pharparas of our own corrupt imaginations to the living waters of Israel<sup>3</sup>; it would be to rely for salvation on the delirious dreams of men, and to despise and disbelieve the unerring Word of God.

Let me hope, my beloved brethren, that in describing this Theory and its consequences, I have not said more than is absolutely required by the interests of truth, and by that solemn duty owed to a Christian Congregation from those who *watch over your souls as they that must give account*<sup>4</sup>.

Before we quit this part of the subject, let me give expression to a hope which will find a ready response in your hearts. It regards a happy issue from the difficulty in which the Church has now been placed.

<sup>1</sup> Titus iii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Pet. iii. 21.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Kings v. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. xiii. 17.

To fall into error is human, and not to persist in error, when pressed and entangled by controversy, is a rare virtue. But, when the excitement of altercation is over,—to review the evidence, and to *retract error*, and embrace truth, is the proper faculty, and noble function, and imperative duty, of creatures endued with Reason and Grace by God. It is a conquest over their worst enemies—wilfulness and pride. And when it tends greatly to advance the glory of God, and to restore the peace of the Church, how necessary is the act, and how glorious is the victory! Who would not rejoice to be able to win it? May it, therefore, please God—the Author of Peace and Lover of Concord—that this Victory may now be won! Peace and goodwill on earth would follow it, and it would gladden the hearts of the blessed Angels in heaven.

VI. Let us now turn from this topic, and consider what is the nature of the *objections* to the *true* doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, as administered to Infants.

Some pious and devout persons appear to imagine that this doctrine is identical with that which they affirm<sup>5</sup> to be taught in the CHURCH of ROME, where (it is alleged) Sacraments are said to confer grace absolutely and inevitably, or, *ex opere operato*, as it is called, that is, by the mere fact of their administration<sup>6</sup>; and they, therefore, recoil from it with aversion and alarm.

<sup>5</sup> The Lutheran or Augsburg Confession (Art. xiii. p. 13, ed. Hase), and Apol. Confess. vii. p. 203, impute this doctrine to the Church of Rome—but it is repudiated by her Divines. See Bellarmin. de Sac. ii. c. 1. T. iii. p. 108. Bossuet, Variations, Book iii. § 22. But (as we shall see) they cannot deny the prevalence of the *practice* which implies the belief of this doctrine.

<sup>6</sup> The doctrine of the Church of Rome is thus declared by the Council of Trent, Sess. vii. Can. 7 and 8 : Si quis dixerit non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper et omnibus quantum est



But we reply; there is a wide distinction between *our* doctrine and that ascribed to the Church of Rome.

1. The teaching of Rome which speaks of the virtue of Sacraments as proceeding from the *work wrought*, does not represent *our* doctrine concerning them. We ascribe all their efficacy to Him Who worketh by Sacraments. Sacraments are instruments of God, whereby He bestows grace, grace not proceeding from the visible sign, but from His Invisible Power. *We* derive their virtue not *ex opere operato, sed ex operâ Operantis*; that is, not from the work wrought, but from Him Who worketh in them and by them,—Almighty God.

2. Next: the Roman Doctrine represents Baptism as removing the *essence and power* of Original Sin, as well as its *guilt*<sup>7</sup>. This is no opinion of ours. We profess, that in Baptism, the *guilt* of original sin is taken away; but we affirm, that “the infection of our nature remains even in them that are regenerate, and though there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized (or regenerate<sup>8</sup>), yet concupiscence hath of itself the nature of sin.”

Here, then, are two fundamental differences between our teaching and that of Rome.

3. Next: there is a wide difference between our *practice*, with regard to Baptism, and hers.

It is well known, that Romish Missionaries have

ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando et aliquibus, anathema sit. Si quis dixerit per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta *ex opere operato* non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere, anathema sit.

<sup>7</sup> Concil. Trid. Sess. v. c. 5. Si quis asserit in baptismo non tolli totum id quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet . . . anathema sit, p. 19; and Catech. Rom. ii. De Bapt. Qu. 31, 32, p. 280. Lib. Symb. Eccl. Rom. ed Gott. 1838.

<sup>8</sup> “Renatis,” in all the Latin editions of the XXXIX Articles, Art. IX.

been in the habit of administering Baptism in an indiscriminate and reckless manner to the children of Heathen, and even to the adult Heathen, without any adequate previous instruction, and with no sufficient provision or preparation, or reasonable probability, that the persons so baptized may and will be trained in Christian truth; and often even without any requirement that they should renounce Idolatry<sup>9</sup>. They scatter the Sacrament about among the wild and untutored multitude, as if it would operate on them by mechanical power, or by a magical charm. This is a desecration of these Divine Mysteries. It is like the casting of *pearls before swine, and giving what is holy to dogs*<sup>1</sup>. From such profaneness as this, we are, it is to be hoped, far removed, both in principle and practice.

Still, while we deplore the errors and corruptions with which the Truth concerning the Sacrament of Baptism has been disguised and disfigured in the Church of Rome, we must not permit the Tempter to rob us thereby of the Truth itself. We must never forget that almost all the errors of Rome contain a residuum of Truth: and thus, in a certain respect, they are more dangerous than *direct negations* of Truth. Our ghostly Enemy uses these errors as instruments for bringing Catholic Truths into discredit; and many pious persons, through infirmity of temper, or insufficiency of knowledge, or unripeness of judgment, have allowed themselves to fall into the snares of the Tempter; and instead of separating *the precious from the vile*<sup>2</sup>, and of retaining the one while they discard the other, and so defeating their Enemy, they have

<sup>9</sup> See the complaints even of Romanists themselves, e. g. in the letter of the Bp. Angelopolis to Pope Innocent X., 1666, and of Sotelus, the Papal Legate, to Urban VIII. concerning Missions in China and Japan. See also the valuable collections and remarks in Archdeacon Grant's Fifth Bampton Lecture.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Jer. xv. 5.

permitted him to make merchandize of them, and have suffered loss of the Truth. Thus it has come to pass, that through hatred and dread of the Romish tenets and practices with regard to this Sacrament, many among us have been despoiled of the great Christian doctrine of Regeneration by Baptism.

But let such persons re-examine the matter with patience, wisdom, and charity: *Let them not be ignorant of Satan's devices*<sup>3</sup>. Let them remember that the Sacraments are "effectual, because of CHRIST's Institution and Promise, although they be administered by evil men<sup>4</sup>." It is a great sin, if they are administered carelessly; but their virtue, which they have from Christ, is not destroyed thereby. If it were, then our immortal souls would be at the mercy of sinful men. But we live by Christ: our souls are in His hand. The Baptism administered by the Church of Rome with Water and in the name of the Holy Trinity is still the Baptism of Christ. And this is clear from the practice even of those very persons who most abhor the Romish doctrine of baptism, and would reject *our* doctrine, because they think it approaches the doctrine of Rome. For, let me ask, would they *re-baptize* a child baptized in the Church of Rome? Certainly not. Not one of the 17,000 Ministers of the Church of England (it is to be hoped) would venture on such an act. And why? There is but one answer. Because there is but "one baptism for the remission of sins." Because the new birth, like the natural birth, can take place but once, and because the child *has been* already born again of Water and the Holy Ghost.

But while we acknowledge, and act upon this truth, let the errors with which it has been overlaid put us on our guard. While we recollect that faith is neces-

<sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Art. XXVI.

sary to salvation, and that an essential part of faith consists in believing that Sacraments are necessary to salvation, and that Baptism is the appointed entrance into a State of salvation, that it is "the well-spring of new birth, wherein original sin is purged<sup>5</sup>," let us beware of imagining that the elements of the Sacraments work by their own power, let us remember that the Sacraments are divinely appointed means of heavenly grace. Let not the Sacrament of Baptism be lavished and squandered, heedlessly and irreverently, nor, except in cases of absolute urgent necessity, be administered in private chambers or empty Churches. But let the Sacrament of Baptism be solemnized gravely, advisedly, soberly, and with godly fear, in the presence of united Congregation, and of the Angels of Heaven looking down upon them, and joining their supplications with the orisons of the Church of Earth. Thus let all be reminded of the high privileges which they received, and the sacred obligations by which they were bound, at their Baptism. So we shall show both by words and deeds the truth of our own doctrine: and thus BAPTISMAL REGENERATION will not be a speculative Theory for polemical disputation, but it will be a practical Reality, a living principle of conduct, and it will lead and carry us onward to the fruition of the joys of heaven.

VII. A second objection to the true doctrine concerning Baptism is derived from the supposed unworthiness of Infants. How, it is asked, being such as they are, can Infants receive grace?

To this we answer,—Strictly speaking *no one* can be worthy of Grace. Otherwise it would not be Grace. *Gratia vocatur quia gratis datur*, says St. August-

<sup>5</sup> Hooker v. lxiv. 3. See also v. lxii. 5: "We are by Baptism born anew;" and v. lxii. 3, he calls Baptism "the Blessed Sacrament of Regeneration."

tine<sup>6</sup>. It is called Grace, because it is given gratis. But, let us observe, *To be unworthy of Grace* is one thing; and *to receive it unworthily* is another. If an *Adult* comes to Baptism without Faith and Repentance, *he* receives it unworthily: but not so an Infant. He brings, it is true, a Nature which has been depraved by Adam's sin. But that Nature was created by God; that Nature has been taken by Christ, it has been borne by Him above the clouds, it is worn by Him at the Right Hand of God. And we do not first love God, but *God first loveth us*<sup>7</sup>. He makes the first motion toward us. Unless *He begins* the work of grace in the heart, it can never be begun at all. The Infant has already received a blessing, and from God, and a signification of His favour, in its natural Birth, without any act or knowledge of its own. And if it is the Child of Believing Parents, it comes into the world with a special promise of spiritual grace. For let us remember, *Now are your children holy*, says St. Paul<sup>8</sup>, and *The promise is to you and your children*<sup>9</sup>, says St. Peter. And *all* infants are to be brought to Christ "by the Mother of believers<sup>10</sup>," the Church, in the Ministry which He has appointed, saying, *Go and baptize all Nations*<sup>1</sup>; and Christ died for all, *He tasted death for every man*<sup>2</sup>; and Infants have souls to be saved, and *He will have all men to be saved*<sup>3</sup>, and it is not His *Father's pleasure that one of these Little Ones should*

<sup>6</sup> Tract. v. in S. Joannem.

<sup>7</sup> John iv. 10.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 14.

<sup>9</sup> Acts ii. 39.

<sup>10</sup> Hooker v. lxiv. 5. Here is the answer to some who appear to imagine that the Church Catechism regards the stipulations of *Sponsors* as of the essence of Infant Baptism. The Private Baptism of Infants without Sponsors refutes this supposition. And the word "sureties" in the Catechism is a general term applicable to the Church herself, the general God-parent, "undertaking the motherly care of our souls." See Hooker's admirable observations, v. lxiv. 5.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. ii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 4.

*perish*<sup>4</sup>, and there is no other appointed way of salvation, no other door to the kingdom of Heaven but by Baptism, for *Except a man*<sup>5</sup> *be born of Water and of the Holy Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*<sup>6</sup>, Christ therefore wills Infants to be baptized, and in order to be saved, they must be born again, for *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*<sup>7</sup>. And Infants are specially liable to sickness and death. Of a hundred Children born in this Metropolis, twenty-four<sup>8</sup> die before they reach the age of two years. Infants, therefore, have special need of Baptism. And let me add, they have special qualifications for it. True it is, they have not actual faith or repentance. But God is not a hard Taskmaster; He does not require impossibilities: He *accepteth a man according to what he hath, and not according to what he hath not*<sup>9</sup>. He specially loves the *two mites of all their living*<sup>1</sup>. The strength of His grace triumphs in an Infant's weakness. His tender love to all is most clearly and beautifully shown in the salvation of new-born babes. *Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings He has ordained strength*<sup>2</sup>. He admitted Infants into the benefits of the covenant under the Old Law by the rite of Circumcision, and made such admission necessary to the attainment of His favour. How<sup>3</sup> much more gracious is He under the Gospel! And though Infants cannot have the *actual faith* and

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xviii. 10. 14.

<sup>5</sup> ἕαν μὴ τις. The English reader may require to be reminded that the word *man* is not in the original here or in Heb. ii. 9, ὑπὲρ πάντων, and that it includes *infants* as well as adults.

<sup>6</sup> John iii. 5.

<sup>7</sup> John iii. 3.

<sup>8</sup> See an Appeal on behalf of a Hospital for Sick Children. Lond. 1850. P. 1.

<sup>9</sup> 2 Cor. viii. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Mark xiii. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. viii. 2. Matt. xxi. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xvii. 10—14.

*repentance* of grown-up men, yet, on the other hand, they do not bring with them the *actual sins* of adults. And grown-up men are sent by Christ to children to learn humility<sup>4</sup>; He exhorteth all men to follow their innocency, *for of such is the kingdom of God*<sup>5</sup>. Their souls, therefore, are the best soil for divine grace. And we cannot doubt that the heavenly seed sown therein at Baptism, will take root and bring forth fair flowers and rich fruits of Paradise, if it be watered with the successive and continuous dew and rain of the Holy Spirit, given in Prayer, and in the hearing and reading of God's word, and in the Apostolic rite of Confirmation, and in the Holy Communion, and in the other regular Ordinances of Religion<sup>6</sup>.

VIII. And here we have a ready answer to the popular objection derived from the *evil lives* of many baptized Persons. How, it is asked, can they be said to have been born again of the Holy Spirit. Where are the *fruits* of the Spirit?

If *we* were of one mind with the Church of Rome, that Baptism destroys the *essence* of Original Sin as well as its guilt; or if we were disciples of Calvin and believed that grace is irresistible and indefectible, and that human free-will is a dream, then we might be perplexed by this question. But since we hold the Faith taught in Scripture and the Primitive Church, it affects us not.

<sup>4</sup> Mark x. 16. Matt. xviii. 2. Luke xviii. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Luke xviii. 15. They are called by the Evangelist *βρέφη*, i. e. *Babes*.

<sup>6</sup> If the reader should desire any further satisfaction on this subject, he will not fail to find it in Hooker v. lxiv. and in Bishop Taylor's *Life of Christ*, Sect. ix. Disc. 6, and *Polemical Disc.* Sect. xviii. Vol. viii. pp. 150—212, and *Waterland*, *Regeneration Stated*, 11. 2. Vol. vi. 356.

Human practice, however general, contrary to the intents of divine grace, proves no defect of divine grace. No one will say that divine grace was not given abundantly by God to the Old World by the preaching of Noah. Yet only eight souls were saved in the ark. No one will say that grace was not poured forth by God in copious showers on the Israelites in the Wilderness. Yet only two men of the old generation, entered into Canaan. No one will say that grace was not shed largely by God on the Jews by the ministry of the Prophets. Yet *the whole head was sick, and the whole heart faint*<sup>7</sup>. No one will say that *grace* did not *come by Jesus Christ*<sup>8</sup>, Whose *lips were full of grace*<sup>9</sup>; yet He had but *a little flock*<sup>1</sup>; and many of *His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him*<sup>2</sup>. So, alas, it is true, lamentably true, that many baptized persons live evil lives; but let no one therefore say that they did not receive grace at Baptism. Be assured, that God *has* done His part. But man has failed to do His. Their Parents or Sponsors or Spiritual Teachers have been culpably remiss or faithless,—especially, if they have taught them that they were *not* regenerate by Baptism. They themselves have neglected or stifled the divine grace given them at Baptism. They have grieved the Holy Spirit of God. And therefore they are guilty in God's sight, and ought to repent; and unless they repent they cannot be saved. And herein consists their sin. For in proportion to God's grace, so is man's sin. And if they had not been born again by baptismal grace, how could they be reprov'd by their Teachers for not living as Christians? how could they be expected to

<sup>7</sup> Isa. i. 5.<sup>8</sup> John i. 17.<sup>9</sup> Ps. xlv. 3.<sup>1</sup> Luke xii. 32.<sup>2</sup> John vi. 67.



walk as children of God? But now, *having received the heavenly gift, and having been made partakers of the Holy Ghost*<sup>3</sup>, let them hear the warnings and encouragements, and obey the precepts of the Gospel. *Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light*<sup>4</sup>.

There are, and can be, but two kinds of profitable teaching; one, that which invites and prepares an unbaptized person to receive baptism; and the other which exhorts those who are baptized to stir up the grace which they received, and to perform the vow which they made, at Baptism, and to pray fervently that as they have been *once regenerated* in Baptism by the Holy Ghost, so they may be *daily renewed* by the same Spirit.

Let me, therefore, in concluding this Discourse, remind you, my beloved brethren, that you *have* been baptized, and have thus been made “members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of heaven.” But it is vain for us to have been born again, unless we live in Christ, by Christ, and for Christ. *Reckon therefore yourselves dead unto sin and alive unto God*<sup>5</sup>. *Mortify your members upon the earth, let not sin reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey the lusts thereof, but yield yourselves unto God as alive from the dead*<sup>6</sup>. *If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right Hand of God*<sup>7</sup>. *So, when Christ, Who is your life, shall appear, you will appear with Him in glory*<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Heb. vi. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Eph. v. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. vi. 10.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. vi. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Col. iii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Col. iii. 4.

*Let us pray.*

ALMIGHTY GOD, Who hast given us thy only-begotten Son to take our nature upon Him, and to be born of a pure Virgin ; Grant that we being regenerate, and made Thy children by adoption and grace, may daily be renewed by Thy Holy Spirit ; through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the same Spirit, ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

GRANT, O Lord, that as we are baptized into the death of thy blessed Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, so by continual mortifying our corrupt affections we may be buried with Him ; and that through the grave, and gate of death, we may pass to our joyful resurrection ; for His merits, Who died, and was buried, and rose again for us, thy Son JESUS CHRIST our Lord. *Amen.*

## SERMON IV.

---

AN ENQUIRY,—WHETHER THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES OF  
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAY BE INTERPRETED IN  
A CALVINISTIC SENSE?

PART I.—THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE COMPARED WITH THE  
TENETS OF CALVIN.

---

1 COR. ii. 13.

*We speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which  
the Holy Ghost teacheth.*

WHAT is the true nature of that transaction which takes place between God and man in the Sacrament of Baptism? is one of the most momentous questions which can come under consideration, even when regarded solely in reference to ourselves. And when we proceed to reflect upon it as parents in respect to children, and, still more extensively, as fellow-Christians with regard to each other, it rises to a degree of importance which can scarcely be exceeded by any other enquiry.

Little inferior in gravity to this question is another:—

What is the character ascribed to Baptism by our Church? In what light does she view it? What is her teaching concerning it?

Having endeavoured on a former occasion to supply an answer to the former of these two enquiries, I proceed now to the second:—

What is the character ascribed to the SACRAMENT of BAPTISM by the CHURCH of ENGLAND?

Her sense on this subject is to be ascertained from her Articles and Liturgical Formularies; and, in order to interpret them, it has been averred by some, that we must refer to the *opinions* of those who *framed them*. It has also been affirmed, that the Framers of our Articles and Baptismal Offices held what are usually called the peculiar tenets of Calvin concerning Election, Predestination, and Final Perseverance; and that, consequently, in accordance with those opinions, they maintained that the grace of Regeneration or New Birth could not be conveyed in Baptism to *all* infants, but only to such as have been elected from eternity by the Sovereign Will of God. Consequently, it has been argued, they could not have *intended* that the Formularies which they drew up should be construed to express a belief that infants *generally* are born again of the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament of Baptism.

It is not my purpose at present to examine the soundness of the allegation, that, in order to understand the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, we must know who its Framers were, and be conversant with their opinions. Nor shall we consider now, whether they held Calvinistic tenets. Other preliminary questions of great importance must first be determined.

The relative parts of the Divine economy for Man's redemption are so harmoniously adjusted, that it is not possible to mar one part without disturbing the framework of the whole. On the other hand, when one part is clearly understood, the remainder becomes more readily intelligible. The Doctrine of Baptism is intimately connected with that of Predestination and its adjuncts; and, in order to do justice to the subject before us, we must begin with enquiring—

i. What is the Doctrine of SCRIPTURE concerning Predestination, Election, and Final Perseverance?

ii. What are the tenets of Calvin on these subjects?

These points being settled, we shall then be in a condition to enquire,

iii. Whether it be true, that the Formularies of the Church of England concerning Baptism may be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense?

We are now to examine, what is the Doctrine of SCRIPTURE concerning Predestination, Election, and Final Perseverance?

The best method of arriving at a clear understanding of this subject, is to keep the mind steadily fixed on the following great truths revealed in Scripture, concerning the Attributes and Acts of Almighty God<sup>1</sup>.

1. Almighty God is infinite in *Knowledge*. *Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world*<sup>2</sup>. He foresees every thing that will be, and He infallibly foreknows every thing that might be. He foresees all the *contingencies* depending on the actions of His free creatures. For example; God foresaw and foretold that Nineveh would be destroyed, unless it repented. *Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown*<sup>3</sup>. Nineveh would have been overthrown, if it had not repented; and this was what God foresaw and foretold. So, when David being in Keilah asked of God, *Will Saul come down, as Thy servant hath heard?* *The Lord answered, He will come down. And when*

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Papers of Hooker, brought to light by Archdeacon Cotton and Dr. Elrington, which were first published at Oxford in 1836, vol. ii. pp. 683—768, in Mr. Keble's edition; but which appear to have been seen and studied by the author of the valuable treatise *Appello Evangelium*, John Playfere, B.D., Sidney-Sussex College, and Rector of Debden, Suffolk, published in London, 1651. Playfere was admitted fellow of his college in 1600, and died in 1632.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xv. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Jonah iii. 4.

*David said, Will the men of Keilah deliver me up? And the Lord said, They will deliver thee up*<sup>4</sup>. David therefore departed from Keilah and thus escaped. David was free to fly or to remain; and if he had used his freedom to remain, *he would* have been given up; and this was what God foresaw and foretold. God, then, foreknows what *would* be, and will *not* be; as well as what *will* be.

2. God is infinite in *Power*. He is Lord over all His works—He says, *I will do all my pleasure; and who hath resisted my will*<sup>5</sup>? It is therefore impossible that any thing should happen, that is not actively ordained, or passively permitted, by God.

3. God is infinite in *Wisdom*. He does not act arbitrarily and fortuitously; but He worketh *all things by the Counsel of His will*<sup>6</sup>. It is impossible that any thing should occur otherwise than under the controul of God, and subject to His *wise* direction for the attainment of His own ends, and for the manifestation of His glory. Hence it is said concerning Christ Himself by St. Peter to the Jews, *Him, being delivered by the determinate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain*<sup>7</sup>. Hence also it is said of Pharaoh, *Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew My power in thee, and that My Name may be declared throughout all the earth*<sup>8</sup>.

But, 4. it must be remembered that God is also infinitely *Just*. *The King's power loveth Judgment*<sup>9</sup>. *Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right*<sup>1</sup>? It is impossible then that God should ever will any thing contrary to Equity, or to those laws of Justice, which He Himself

<sup>4</sup> 1 Sam. xxiii. 11, 12.

<sup>5</sup> Isa. xlv. 10. Rom. ix. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Ephes. i. 11.

<sup>7</sup> Acts ii. 23.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. ix. 17. Exod. ix. 16.

<sup>9</sup> Ps. xcix. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xviii. 25.

has revealed to us in His holy word. Being infinite in Justice, He must detest evil; and what, so detesting, He righteously *punishes* in others, He Himself cannot *do*. He *cannot* therefore be the Author of sin. Yet it is true that sin could not exist without His foreknowledge, or contrary to His permission. Sin is an evil; but not of God's production. And punishment is an evil; but it is no direct end, desired or designed by God. It arises as it were contingently; it is a consequence justly ensuing on Man's sin, and it is made by God to subserve His own glory. Thus it was with the sin and punishment of Pharaoh and of Judas, out of whose sins God, by His special attribute of educing good from evil, brought redemption for Israel and salvation for the world, and glory to Himself.

5. And further: God is also infinite in *Goodness*. *His Mercy is over all His works*<sup>2</sup>. *God is Love*<sup>3</sup>. *He hateth nothing that He hath made*. It is impossible therefore that He should do any thing which is inconsistent with Mercy, combined with, and not independent of, much less contrary to, His *other* attributes of Knowledge, Power, Wisdom, and Justice.

We read, it is true, in Scripture, concerning Jacob and Esau, that when they *were yet unborn, and had done neither good nor evil, in order that the purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth, it was said unto their mother Rebecca, The elder shall serve the younger, as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated*<sup>4</sup>. So, then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy<sup>5</sup>.

But we must remember, that though the children had done neither good nor evil, yet God foreknew

<sup>2</sup> Ps. cxlv. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Mal. i. 2, 3.

<sup>3</sup> 1 John iv. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. ix. 16.

all that they would do; and that although no good foreseen in Jacob could in the least degree *merit* or *cause* God's love, for God calleth us not *according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace* <sup>6</sup>, yet God loves *all* His faithful and obedient servants in Christ, and graciously accepts and freely rewards them in Him. That which God *loved* in Jacob, was Jacob created by God, and redeemed by Christ; and what God *hated* and punished in Esau, was not any thing which God had made in him (for God hateth nothing that He has made), but what Esau had chosen for himself; it was not Esau's *nature* that God hated, but his profaneness; it was his contempt of his birthright, and his bartering away of his spiritual privileges for a carnal indulgence. This is what God clearly foreknew, and justly hated, and righteously punished in Esau.

Keeping our eyes steadily fixed on all these attributes of God—namely, His Prescience, His Power, His Wisdom, His Justice, and His Mercy—let us now place ourselves in imagination at a time *before* the Creation of Man. Let us consider man's existence, not as a thing actual, but only as *possible*; and let us examine how the question would then stand, and what would be the sequence of events which might be anticipated from the revealed Attributes of God.

1. God, being Infinite in Knowledge, perceived, from all Eternity, that if He should be pleased, in the free exercise of His Sovereign Will, and for the manifestation of His glory, to create Man—that is, a Being superior to other creatures, and endued with Reason and Free Will—then, while Reason, which is a faculty of his nature, would dictate the preference of good, man, by the exercise of his Free Will, which is also a

<sup>6</sup> 2 Tim. i. 9.



faculty of his nature, might decline to evil, or adhere to good.

2. God perceived also, from all Eternity, that if man fell away from good, and that if in the exercise of His free Grace and Mercy in His Well Beloved Son, He Himself should provide means for the restoration of *all* men, still left reasonable and free (though with their Reason marred, and Free Will impaired by the Fall); and if, in consequence of man's weakness and corruption, man could do nothing good without Divine Grace; and yet Grace should be tempered and dispensed in such a manner as to perfect man's Free Will, but not to destroy it, some men would receive that Grace, and some would reject it.

3. God perceived also, in His infinite knowledge, that if He should condemn those who received His Grace in vain, or despised and abused it, and should accept those who thankfully received and carefully cherished it, He would act justly to the one, and mercifully to the other.

4. Further, since God is Infinite in Knowledge, it is impossible that He should not have foreseen from Eternity every *individual* who would either thankfully avail himself of His gracious offers, or would stubbornly refuse them. He foreknew from Eternity every one *who* would be *elect in CHRIST*. He foreknew, also, who would be the vessels of deserved wrath and righteous punishment.

But this Infinite Foreknowledge, thus extending to particulars, while it embraced every thing, would *cause nothing*; it would not impose any restriction or controul on man's Free Will; it would neither compel him to receive, nor inhibit him from accepting, God's gracious offers in Christ, which, as God Himself witnesseth in Scripture, were pre-ordained *before the foundation of the world*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxv. 34. Eph. i. 4. 9; iii. 11. 1 Pet. i. 20. Rev. xiii. 8.

Men, as God's creatures, being objects of God's love, and offers of salvation being made in Christ to all, with a hearty desire on God's part that all should receive them, and this Prescience of God, with regard to the future condition of every one, being left an inscrutable secret in the unfathomable abysses of His own Mind, and not being divulged to men, it could not be, that God's Foreknowledge could minister occasion either of presumption on one side, or desperation on the other.

And yet, it being true that nothing can occur without the actual ordinance or passive permission of God, it would follow from all these considerations taken together, that God would rightly be said to *have predestinated to eternal life* those who would be saved, and to have *rejected those* who should fail of everlasting salvation <sup>8</sup>.

Here we have been supposing that the Creation of man had not yet taken place. The Divine Eye of God had all these things which we have now been contemplating present to it from Eternity. God in His supreme and universal sovereignty, and absolute freedom, might have so willed it, that *none* of these things should ever take place. But, having all these things before Him as *possible* in the volume of His Prescience, His Almighty Hand subscribed to what His Eye read, and His Almighty Voice proclaimed, that what was there written as possible, should be carried into effect.

Let us therefore now suppose that His Fiat has been issued for man's Creation; and let us see how God Himself represents His own actual dealings with man in His own Word.

I. He declares, that He *has* created all men *free* to

<sup>8</sup> Rom. ix. 11. 16. 30. Eph. i. 5. Rom. viii. 29, 30.

decline evil and to cleave to good. *See I have set before thee this day life, and good, and death, and evil; therefore choose life*<sup>9</sup>. *Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat*<sup>1</sup>. *And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely*<sup>2</sup>. And God declares that none can perish, but by their own fault. *Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee*<sup>3</sup>. *O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself*<sup>4</sup>. He represents men as guilty, not because they are doomed to sin, but because *He calls and they refuse to hearken, and will have none of His reproofs*<sup>5</sup>; and because they pull away the shoulder, and stop their ears, and make their hearts as adamant, lest they should hear the law which<sup>6</sup> He hath sent in His Spirit<sup>7</sup>.

It is true, indeed, that God is sometimes represented in Scripture as *making* men spiritually deaf and blind. But this is the consequence and punishment of their sins: it is their appropriate and righteous retribution for closing their ears and eyes. Thus it is said, that *God hardened Pharaoh's heart*<sup>8</sup>. But this was a *just chastisement to Pharaoh* for having hardened his own heart. For it is written, *Pharaoh hardened his heart, neither would he let the people go*<sup>9</sup>, *when he said there was a respite*<sup>10</sup>, *and when the hail and thunder ceased, he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants*<sup>1</sup>. Because Pharaoh chose to despise God's tremendous judgments, which were designed to bring him to repentance, and to salvation, and because

<sup>9</sup> Deut. xi. 26. 28; xxx. 15. 19.

<sup>1</sup> Isa. lv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xxii. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Hos. iv. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. xiii. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Jer. vii. 31. Prov. i. 24. 29.

<sup>6</sup> Bp. Andrewes on the Lambeth Articles, p. 120, ed. 1700: "The cause why all either are not drawn, or so drawn as to come to God, is the corrupt will of man, not the absolute will of God."

<sup>7</sup> Zech. vii. 11, 12. <sup>8</sup> Exod. vii. 13; ix. 12; x. 1. 20. 27; xi. 10.

<sup>9</sup> Exod. viii. 32.

<sup>10</sup> Ib. viii. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Ib. ix. 34, 35.

he wilfully *rejected God's counsel* <sup>2</sup>, therefore God gave him over to a *reprobate mind* <sup>3</sup>, and *chose his delusions* <sup>4</sup>, and *punished* him by his sin.

Here, also, we find a reply to the objection derived from the words of St. Paul, *Hath not the potter authority* <sup>5</sup> *over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel to honour, and another unto dishonour.* Therefore, it is argued, He created some men *in order* that they might be saved, and others *in order* that they might be lost. But the analogy does not hold. Almighty God has not created man to be only a subject of His *Power*, but He made him to be a subject also of His *Love*. He did *not* create man to be an inert, irrational, lifeless mass of clay, but He gave him Free Will. He breathed into him a living soul, and the human clay became a treasure-house of divine grace <sup>6</sup>. Man's Free Will is willed to be a part of his nature by God; it is a result of God's Free Will, and God cannot will away His own will; and God's grace perfects our Free Will, but does not destroy it. And St. Paul himself answers the objection in another place by appealing to man's Free Will, and saying,—*Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity. In a great house* (that is, in the Visible Church of God) *there are many vessels, some to honour, and some to dishonour. If a man, therefore, purge himself from these* (evil things), *he shall be a vessel to honour.* And St. Paul does *not* say that God *created* vessels for wrath; but that He *endured* them. God does not *make*, but *find*, vessels of *wrath*; and He does not *find*, but *make*, vessels of *grace*.

And further, God declares in His word, not only that He leaves freedom of choice to all, but He represents

<sup>2</sup> Luke vii. 30.      <sup>3</sup> Rom. i. 28.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. lxvi. 4; Jer. ii. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Ἐξουσίαν, Rom. ix. 21.

<sup>6</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 7.

Himself as *earnestly desiring* that all should *choose* good as the means of their own happiness. We are all commanded by Christ to pray to God as *Our Father*. God is represented as *spreading out His Hands all day to His people*<sup>7</sup>, and as loving them even when alienated from Him. God declares His love to us by a solemn oath, *As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live*. He expostulates with them. *Why will ye die, O house of Israel*<sup>8</sup>? *He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. He is not willing that any perish, but that all should come to repentance*<sup>9</sup>. And how did He manifest His love? When we were yet enemies, He gave His only begotten Son to die for the sins of the world. God so loved the world, as to give His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life<sup>1</sup>, and He is the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him<sup>2</sup>. When the kindness and love of God our Saviour unto man appeared, according to His mercy He saved us<sup>3</sup>. And God hereby commends His love unto us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us<sup>4</sup>. And, lest we should imagine that Christ came only to save a few, He is called the SAVIOUR of the WORLD. He is the Lamb of God, Which taketh away the sins of the world<sup>5</sup>. He is a propitiation, not only for our sins, but for the sins of the whole world<sup>6</sup>. The Lord laid upon Him the iniquity of us all<sup>7</sup>. He gave Himself a ransom for all<sup>8</sup>. He died for all<sup>9</sup>. Adam was a type of Christ<sup>1</sup>. We all derive a nature, tainted and dis-

<sup>7</sup> Isa. lxxv. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 4. 2 Pet. iii. 9.

<sup>1</sup> John iii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. v. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Tit. iii. 4, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. v. 8.

<sup>5</sup> John i. 29. 36.

<sup>6</sup> 1 John iv. 14. John i. 29. 1 John ii. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. liii. 5—10.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 6.

<sup>9</sup> 2 Cor. v. 15.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 22.

eased, from Adam, and, in God's desire and purpose, we all have in Christ a purification for that corruption, and a remedy for that disease. As St. Paul says, *As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of One, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life*<sup>2</sup>. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all are made alive<sup>3</sup>.

Indeed it appears expressly from Holy Scripture, that Christ died, not only for those who *accept* God's offer of grace and salvation tendered to them in Him, but that He died also for those who *reject* it. God in Christ designed the eternal welfare of His greatest enemies. We read that the Scribes and Pharisees *rejected God's counsel toward themselves*<sup>4</sup>; and the Jews are stated to have *thrust away the Gospel* from them<sup>5</sup>. The merits of Christ's death reached even to His bitterest foes, even to those who would continue so to the end; and one of the sharpest pangs endured by our Blessed Lord was inflicted by the foreseen ingratitude of those whom He came to save. Witness His tears shed over Jerusalem<sup>6</sup>. *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not*<sup>7</sup>. And the Apostle St. Peter says, that *wicked* men were redeemed by Christ. *They denied the Lord that bought them*<sup>8</sup>. And St. Paul teaches, that they for whom Christ suffered may *perish*, through the bad example of others. *By thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died*<sup>9</sup>. And again, he says of those that *draw back unto perdition*, that they *tread under foot the Son of God, and count the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith they were*

<sup>2</sup> Rom. v. 18.

<sup>4</sup> Luke vii. 30, εἰς ἑαυτούς.

<sup>6</sup> Luke xix. 41.

<sup>8</sup> 2 Pet. ii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xiii. 46.

<sup>7</sup> Matt. xxiii. 37.

<sup>9</sup> Rom. xiv. 15.

*sanctified, an unholy thing, and do despite unto the Spirit of grace*<sup>1</sup>? Hence it is abundantly clear in the words of Scripture, that *Christ tasted death for every man*<sup>2</sup>.

If now it be asked, since Christ died for all, why are not all saved? The reply is, that men love darkness rather than light; They do not *like to retain God in their knowledge*; They *resist the Holy Ghost*; They *despise the riches of God's goodness*; They *neglect so great salvation*<sup>3</sup>. But God has done His part. *What could have been done for My vineyard*, He says, *that I have not done for it*<sup>4</sup>? God desires man's happiness; but if man, in the exercise of his free will, chooses sin, the means of his misery, although God encourages and enables him to choose holiness, then God in His justice punishes sin—of which God is not the Author, but the Righteous Avenger. It has well been asked; if God had not given grace, how could He save the world; and if man were not free, how could God judge the world? *Why* God created man free, and therefore liable to fall, is not for us to know. Here is an exercise for our Faith; we see but in a glass darkly, but we know that God is infinitely Just, and Wise and Good. And we can well comprehend how it redounds more to His glory, and to our happiness, for Him to be served by freemen than by slaves; but we must close that speculation in the words of the Apostle, *How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out*<sup>5</sup>!

Still further. It has pleased God to institute religious Ordinances, which are to be of visible application, and perpetual endurance, even unto the end of the world: and by which His grace and good will in Christ is conveyed to the souls of men. As Eve, the

<sup>1</sup> Heb. x. 39. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> John iii. 19. Acts vii. 51. Rom. ii. 3. Heb. ii. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. v. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. xi. 33.

natural mother of *all* living, was formed from the side of Adam; so the Church, the spiritual mother of all living, was formed from the Side of Christ. And her life is derived from Him and His death, through the Holy Sacraments<sup>6</sup>, which are universal in place and time. *Go ye into all the world. Go and baptize all nations. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. And, Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. We are all baptized by one Spirit into one Body, And, As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.*

Here, then, is an actual conveyance of that grace of universal Redemption which Christ procured and purchased for the whole world by His precious Death upon the Cross. Here is a *Laver of regeneration* for the whole human race; here Christ stands and says, *Wash, and be clean*; here His ministers proclaim, in the words of St. Peter, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*<sup>7</sup>.

"It hath been the doctrine *constantly with general consent* delivered in and by the Catholic Church, that to *all persons* by the Holy Mystery of Baptism duly initiated into Christianity, and admitted into the communion of Christ's Body, the grace of the Holy Spirit is communicated; which Spirit they are admonished not to resist, to abuse, to quench<sup>8</sup>, but to use it well, and improve its grace to the working out their salvation<sup>9</sup>."

Such are God's offers, unreserved, unrestrained, universal. But man's freedom is not destroyed by them. Man may reject those offers; he may abuse them; he

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hooker, V. lvi. 7. See above, Sermon. III., p. 49.

<sup>7</sup> Acts ii. 38.

<sup>8</sup> Eph. iv. 30. 1 Cor. xii. 9. Phil. ii. 13.

<sup>9</sup> Barrow, vol. III. Sermon. xl. p. 461, On Universal Redemption.



may forget that, as God is holy, so he must be holy; he may quench the Spirit; he may choke the seed sown in his heart; he may stifle the whispers of Divine Grace breathed into his soul; he may neglect to work out his salvation with fear and trembling; and, instead of making his calling and election sure by prayer, and watchfulness, and holy obedience, he may sink into a spiritual lethargy; he may become, unto every good work reprobate; and then what will the waters of Baptism profit him? What will the Body and Blood of Christ avail him? They will only aggravate his guilt, and increase his condemnation, for *To whom much is given, of him much shall be required*<sup>1</sup>.

Here, then, all boasting is excluded on one side, and all murmuring on the other. They who are predestinated to life are elected for no merit of their own, but by God's mercy in Christ; they who are reprobated are reprobated, not from any desire of His, but for their own sins<sup>2</sup>. *God* sees our future state. He has foreknown from Eternity, who will stand on the right hand, and who on the left at the Great Day. But *man* cannot know the future state of any one.

*Our own* salvation or condemnation, which is infallibly known to God, is free and contingent to us. It is our duty to believe the Scripture, which declares that we are placed in a state of salvation, when we are admitted by the door of Baptism into the Church; and it is for us to use the offers which God makes to us of assistance to work our salvation, and to fear lest we forfeit our privileges by receiving grace in vain, or by resisting or abusing it. So with regard to *others*, God alone can read the heart. *We* must not pronounce judgment on our brother men; we cannot distinguish and separate between the evil and the

<sup>1</sup> Luke xii. 48.

<sup>2</sup> See Bp. ANDREWES on the Lambeth Articles, p. 122.

good ; we can only speak according to what we see and hear. *We must suppose*, therefore, that *all* who are baptized and profess the true faith are *elect*<sup>3</sup>. And therefore the Apostles address *whole* Congregations, containing many weak, wayward, and erring members, as *elect*<sup>4</sup>. The *entire* Church Visible is elect in the eye of *man* ; but the Church Invisible *alone* is elect in the *eye* of God.

II. Thus have I endeavoured to lay before you the doctrine taught in Holy Scripture concerning Predestination, Divine Grace, and Human Free Will. It now remains that we should compare with it the tenets, commonly called Calvinistic, on these same subjects.

The eminent person from whom they derive their name, was born in France early in the sixteenth century<sup>5</sup>. He displayed in his youth great ability and proficiency in the study of the ancient languages<sup>6</sup>, and of canon and civil law. He next devoted himself to theology ; and it is a remarkable fact, that the Work

<sup>3</sup> Numerous errors have been committed in theological writings, by confounding the two meanings of *Election*, i. e. as the word is used with regard to *God's* knowledge, or to *man's*. *God's* Elect cannot finally fall from grace. (Rom. viii. 33. Matt. xxiv. 22.) But *God's* Elect are known to God *alone*. Any of those whom *man* must suppose to be Elect may fall from grace ; and *all* who receive the sacraments and profess the faith of Christ, are to be regarded as Elect in *man's* eye.

These considerations would have preserved the writings of Hooker and other great English Theologians, from certain misconstructions, which have been lately put upon them in the examination of this subject.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Pet. i. 2. 9. Col. iii. 2. 1 Thess. i. 4. 2 John i. 13. Rom. xvi. 13. So St. Ignatius calls the *Church* of Ephesus, ἐκκληλεγμένη, cap. 1, and Tralles, ἐκλεκτή, cap. 1 ; and ἐκλεκτοί are opposed to heathens (Mart. Poly. c. 16).

<sup>5</sup> At Noyon, in Picardy, July 10, A.D. 1509.

<sup>6</sup> He published an edition of Seneca de Clementiâ, with Latin notes, at Paris in 1532.

on which his reputation as a theologian mainly rests was produced and published by him at the early age of twenty-seven<sup>7</sup>. This was his *Christian Institution*; a system of Doctrine and Discipline, framed with a methodical exactness, and clothed in the attractive dress of vigorous and elegant Latinity.

This Body of Theology has exercised a more powerful influence than any similar work which has appeared in Europe since the revival of letters. It appeared at a season when the want of such a treatise was widely felt. The Church of Rome had her Master of Sentences, and her Angelic Doctor; but the Reformed Churches were almost without a systematic Manual of Protestant Theology. Calvin came forward to supply the need in his *Christian Institution*. Lucid in style, compact and comprehensive in form, well-digested in matter<sup>8</sup>, and elaborate in execution, it soon became a text-book in schools and universities in various parts of Christendom. Its spirit was infused into sermons and theological treatises, and even into dissertations on government and political harangues<sup>9</sup>. It was said of

<sup>7</sup> The Dedication of his *Institution* to Francis I. is dated Aug. 1, 1536.

<sup>8</sup> In these respects, Melancthon's *Loci Theologici*, published in 1535, with a dedication to King Henry VIII., can hardly come into comparison with it.

<sup>9</sup> See HOOKER, Pref. ii. 8. Bishop Sanderson speaking of his own course of studies, pursued at Oxford 1603—1619. "I read over with great diligence, and no less delight, that excellent piece of learned *Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, and I have great cause to bless God for it, not only &c. &c., but that it also proved, by His good Providence, a good preparative to me, that I say not *antidote*, for the reading of *Calvin's Institutions*: For that book (of Calvin) was commended to me, as it was generally to all young scholars in those times." See the late Dr. Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biog.* iv. p. 416 and 320. King James I. foresaw the evils likely to result from the Genevan text book, and, in his letter to the Universities, (Jan. 18, 1616,) enjoined the study of the Fathers in its place.

Calvin, that when he is right, no one more right than he<sup>10</sup>; and it may be added, that when he is wrong, no one's errors are more dangerous than his.

These errors not only concern Christian doctrine, but Church discipline, and civil government. The primitive form of ecclesiastical polity by bishops was now to give way to the Presbyterian regimen, which was soon affirmed to be of Divine obligation. And the prerogatives of Christian princes in matters ecclesiastical were to be extinguished as sacrilegious invasions of Christ's power, and tyrannical outrages against His Church<sup>1</sup>.

Hence it came to pass that the Christian Institution of the youthful French Theologian shook Churches from their foundations; it subverted thrones; it brought armies into the field of Christians against Christians, and of citizens against citizens. We see its effects in our own day in the feuds of Switzerland and of Scotland, and in the religious discords which agitate England and America.

I proceed now to state the doctrines of Calvin on the questions before us. And to guard against any possibility of misrepresentation, I shall do this by means of a translation of his own words.

This is the more necessary, because many vague and erroneous notions concerning Calvinistic tenets appear to be now prevalent; and I cannot forbear expressing

<sup>10</sup> "Ubi bene, nemo melius," Bp. Barlow's Remains, p. 11.

<sup>1</sup> See Hooker VIII. ii. 14; VIII. iv. 8, and Bossuet, Variations, x. 20, who observes that, "The English Doctrine which makes the King the Supreme Governor of the Church was condemned by Calvin and the Calvinists," who (as Archbishop Bancroft says, 'Survey of Pretended Holy Discipline,' p. 258,) "derogate from Christian Princes, and arrogate to their Elderships, the Supreme and Immediate Authority under Christ in causes Ecclesiastical," and so "in the oppugning of Princes' authority in causes Ecclesiastical, they join with the Papists."

a deliberate conviction, that they who impute the tenets of Calvin to the Church of England have not carefully examined what Calvinistic tenets are.

Calvin regards the human race as a vast mass of corruption; and he affirms that out of this mass a few are selected by God, and the rest are left to destruction, without hope or offer of salvation. "God," says he, "preordained and forewilled Adam's fall," and "all are born of the same corrupt mass of perdition," and "out of this mass God elects some<sup>2</sup>."

"Predestination," he says, "is the eternal decree of God, by which He determined what He would do with every man. For all men are not created on equal terms; but to some of them eternal life is preordained, and to others eternal condemnation. Therefore, accordingly as a person is created for one or other of these two ends, so, I affirm, he is predestined either to life or death<sup>3</sup>." They who are called to a state of salvation are *few* in number compared with those who are left in a state of perdition. "The Grace of God" (he says) "does not rescue many from eternal death: and it leaves the world in that perdition to which it is doomed<sup>4</sup>."

He teaches that they who have once received grace can never fall away.

"They," he says, "who are *once* engrafted by Christ into His body can never perish; for Christ will exert the power of God to preserve them, which power is greater than all: they who are incorporated in Christ can never fail of salvation<sup>5</sup>."

He defines saving faith to be a *personal* assurance in the *individual* that he himself will be saved. Thus,—

<sup>2</sup> De Prædest. pp. 607, 608. 613. Inst. III. xxiii. § 3, 4. 7; Comm. in Rom. ix. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Calvin, Inst. III. c. xxi. § 5.

<sup>4</sup> Calvin, Inst. III. xxii. § 7.

<sup>5</sup> Inst. III. xxii. § 7; xxi. § 7; III. ii. § 12.

“Faith is a firm and certain knowledge of God’s good will to *ourselves*; and he only is a true believer, who being persuaded of God’s fatherly love to himself, and relying on His promises to himself, has an undoubting confidence in his own future salvation<sup>6</sup> ;” and hence a Calvinistic Synopsis, published at Leyden, says, “Faith is a sure persuasion, by which the believer rests on God, and is convinced in himself, not only that remission of sin is promised *generally* to the faithful, but that it is given *to himself personally*, and, with it, justification and eternal life<sup>7</sup>.”

Here, let us observe, is the secret of the success and popularity of Calvinism. At first you might think that human nature would shudder and recoil from it with horror and alarm, on account of the view which it presents of the Divine being and His dealings with man. But let us remember, there is in the heart of man a strong spirit of pride, whispering to him that he is holier than others, and a special favourite with God. With this strong spirit of pride Calvinism leagues itself; and, having this Legion on its side, it works and conquers.

Let us here, also, remark how this system refutes itself. According to Calvin the elect are *few*, compared with the reprobate. It is the duty of all men to *believe*. And, according to him, Faith consists in an assurance of *personal* favour with God. Consequently, it is *every* one’s *duty* to realize this assurance. Every true Calvinist must do so. If, therefore, the *greater* part of the world were to become believers in

<sup>6</sup> Inst. III. ii. § 16. Dr. Barrow says concerning this tenet of Calvin, “Much less is that notion of Faith right, which defines Faith to be a firm and certain knowledge of God’s eternal good will towards *us particularly*, and that we shall be saved; which was taught in the beginning of the Reformation by a man of greatest name and authority, *i. e.* Calvin.” See Barrow on Justifying Faith, vol. ii. Sermon. iv. p. 66.

<sup>7</sup> See also Inst. III. vii. xxviii.

a Calvinistic sense, then Calvinism would be proved to be false.

But to return. According to Calvin, they who are once born again in Christ can never fall away; therefore he who has once realized this assurance of God's special favour to himself personally, may feel sure of salvation. Here is another source of its mysterious power.

We have seen the tenets of Calvin concerning Election.

Let us now examine his doctrine concerning Reprobation.

All they who will fail of salvation, are represented by him as created for the purpose of being condemned eternally.

"Almighty God" (he says) "created them, for shame in life, and for perdition in death <sup>8</sup>."

"They are born from their mother's womb devoted to inevitable destruction <sup>9</sup>."

Hence Calvin is far from allowing that Christ died *for all men*; or that offers of salvation are made freely by God in Him to all, and that the merits of His sufferings extend to all nations in every age. On the contrary, he thus speaks:—"How comes it to pass that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations, with their Infant children, irremediably, in everlasting perdition? How, but because it so pleased God. *Decretum quidem horribile, fateor!* A horrible decree! I grant it. But no one can deny that God foreknew what would be the end of man, before He created him; and He therefore foreknew it, because He *Himself had so fore-ordained it* <sup>10</sup>."

God therefore created Adam in order that he might fall, and involve all his posterity in perdition, from which only a few are rescued by divine grace, and the remainder are left in a state of irretrievable ruin.

<sup>8</sup> Inst. III. xxiv. § 12.

<sup>9</sup> Inst. III. xxiii. § 6.

<sup>10</sup> Inst. III. xxiii. § 7.

Hence Free Will is no essential part of man's nature. Calvin expressly says, "Man's desires and endeavours have no part in working out his salvation <sup>1</sup>." "It is not in man's power to refuse or to accept divine grace <sup>2</sup>." "God" (he says) "so moves the will not (as for many ages it has been taught and believed) as if it were in our choice whether we will resist or obey the motions of grace." "We must repudiate the assertion so often iterated by Chrysostom, in which he says <sup>3</sup>, that 'Whom God draws, He draws willing to be drawn <sup>4</sup>.'"

Hence the sounder Confession of the LUTHERANS, to be subscribed by their Clergy, thus speaks:—

"The false and erroneous doctrine of the CALVINISTS concerning Predestination and Providence is as follows:—

- "I. That CHRIST did not die for all, but only for the elect.
- "II. That God created the greatest part of men for damnation; and willeth not that they should be converted and live.
- "III. That the Elect and Regenerate cannot lose their faith, or forfeit the grace of the Holy Ghost, or be damned, although they commit heinous sins.
- "IV. That those who are not elect are necessarily damned and cannot be saved . . . although they live holy and blameless lives <sup>5</sup>."

From what has now been said you may readily infer what the teaching of Calvin is concerning the Sacrament of Baptism. "It is a great error," he says, "to imagine that Sacraments confer grace, provided we do not oppose to them the bar of mortal sin" (which is the case with Infants). "This opinion," (he adds) "is

<sup>1</sup> Inst. III. xxiv. § 1.

<sup>2</sup> Inst. II. iii. § 11.

<sup>3</sup> See Chrys. in Joann. vi. 44.

<sup>4</sup> Inst. II. iii. § 10.

<sup>5</sup> From Articuli Visitatorii a Ministris Ecclesiarum, &c. ad subscribendum propositi anno Christi 1592. See Hase Libri Symbolici, p. 866, ed. Lips. 1837.



*pernicious, deadly, diabolical* <sup>6</sup>." In Baptism there is no virtue of regeneration or salvation, but only a knowledge and assurance of them <sup>7</sup>."

Baptism is not represented as an effectual means of grace, but a sign and assurance to the *elect* that God pardons their sins <sup>8</sup>.

The children of *believers* <sup>9</sup> are baptized, not in order that they may *be made* therein the children of God; but they are thus by a sacred sign received into the Church because they *already belong* to Christ's body <sup>1</sup>. And one of Calvin's disciples says <sup>2</sup>, that "S. Augustine greatly erred in attributing too much efficacy to Baptism; for he did not perceive that it is only an outward Mark of Regeneration; but asserted that by the act of Baptism we are regenerate and adopted and engrafted into the family of Christ."

It may not be imagined, that, according to Calvin, *all* children of believers, being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are saved. No: only *elect* children are saved, and they are not saved *by* Baptism, but by special grace, given irrespectively of Baptism. No one can be saved without Regeneration; and Regeneration is

<sup>6</sup> Inst. IV. xiv. § 14. Here he condemns the language of St. Augustine, who says (Epist. xcvi. ad Bonifac. § 10), *Parvulus fidem etiamsi non habeat in cogitatione, non ei tamen obicem contrariæ voluntatis opponit, unde sacramentum salubriter percipit.*

<sup>7</sup> Inst. IV. xv. § 2. <sup>8</sup> Inst. IV. xv. § 1. 10; IV. xvi. § 22.

<sup>9</sup> Incredible it may appear, but so it is, Calvin would not baptize the children of Papists; for, said he, "it is an absurd thing for us to baptize them who cannot be reckoned members of our own body." Calvin to Farel, Ep. 149. On which Hooker observes, III. i. 1. "The answer of Calvin unto Farel concerning Popish children, doth seem crazed." See also Hooker, V. lxiv. 5, on baptizing the children of *Unbelievers*. <sup>1</sup> Inst. IV. xv. § 20. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Martyr, Class IV. loc. cap. ix. sect. 14. *Graviter hallucinatus est Augustinus, quod nimium Baptismo tribuerit; non enim agnoscit illum esse regenerationis externum symbolum, sed ipsâ tingendi actione vult nos regenerari et adoptari atque in familiam Christi transire.*

not offered to all; but they only are thereby restored whom God chooses as heirs of salvation<sup>3</sup>. And it is not effected at once, but by a long process<sup>4</sup>. God regenerates the elect only; and in such a way that the heavenly seed never perishes out of their hearts<sup>5</sup>. And those Infants to whom God has vouchsafed His electing grace, if they die before they grow up, having received the *sign* of Regeneration, are renewed by the virtue of God's Spirit, incomprehensible to us, and so are saved<sup>6</sup>. But<sup>7</sup> the Covenant of God does not depend upon Baptism<sup>8</sup>.

Such are Calvin's tenets, expressed in his own words, on the subjects now before us<sup>9</sup>.

Gladly would I have spared you, my brethren, this recital. Since, however, it has been affirmed, that the Formularies of the CHURCH of England are not inconsistent with the tenets of Calvin, and that her Baptismal offices may be construed in a Calvinistic sense, it is requisite that the Ministers of the Church should

<sup>3</sup> Inst. IV. xvi. § 17—22; III. iii. § 9.

<sup>4</sup> Inst. III. iii. § 9.

<sup>5</sup> Inst. III. ii. § 11, 12.

<sup>6</sup> Inst. IV. xvi. § 21.

<sup>7</sup> So Beza Colloqui. Mompelg. p. 479. Infantes illi qui sunt in reproborum numero non regenerantur, si millies baptizentur.

<sup>8</sup> Inst. IV. xv. § 20, 21, 22.

<sup>9</sup> A summary of Calvin's doctrine is given by Gerhard Loci Comm. Theol. (ii. p. 89, ed. Genev. 1639,) as follows:—

Deus ab æterno sibi proposuit quosdam homines damnare, quosdam salvare. Hoc est quasi primum Dei decretum.

Illud decretum ut executioni dari posset ideo decrevit ut primi homines peccarent, suoque lapsu se et omnes posteros æterno exitio involverent. Hoc est quasi alterum Dei decretum.

Ex damnatâ illâ totius humani generis massâ Deus quosdam absolutâ gratia, *i. e.* quoscunque libuerit, eligit, et *illis* Christum Mediatorem prædicationem verbi et fidem ordinavit, ut per hæc media salutis fiant participes. Hoc est quasi tertium Dei decretum.

Denique reliqua innumerabilis multitudo ex absoluto ejus odio, *i. e.* quasi ita libuerit, a salute et salutis mediis rejecta est, et ad peccatum et ad causas reprobationis prædestinata. Hoc est quasi quartum Dei decretum.

declare, and that the People should hear, what Calvinistic tenets are.

In listening to these melancholy details, you can hardly have failed to observe, that this scheme of doctrine labours under a fatal defect; it represents God simply as a Being endued with infinite Prescience and omnipotent Will, and pays no regard to His *attributes* of Goodness, Wisdom, and Justice; nor to His *acts* of Universal Love in Christ; nor to man's innate faculties of Reason and Free Will; nor to God's declaration that man *is* a reasonable, free, and *therefore* a responsible, being. It contravenes these truths; it casts a veil over God's revelations of them, and over His commandments founded upon them.

"That which moveth God to work is Goodness, that which ordereth His work is Wisdom, and that which perfecteth His work is Power."—So said a wise Theologian of our own <sup>1</sup>. But Calvin's system takes no such comprehensive view. It does not display the Deity in the harmonious symmetry of *all* His revealed perfections; but in a partial, false, and distorted picture. It does not represent Him as a merciful Creator, and bountiful Benefactor, and compassionate Father, and righteous Judge, to be loved and revered by His creatures and children; but as a capricious and passionate Autocrat, to be flattered by self-idolizing favourites; or as a stern and arbitrary Taskmaster, to be feared by despairing slaves.

HOLY SCRIPTURE displays the Divine Attributes blended like the prismatic hues, tempered together with harmonious beauty, in the radiant Iris, which majestically spans the firmament, and pours a stream of heavenly light on the earth,—speaking of awful Justice gilded with the beams of Mercy. But in the system of Calvin this glorious Vision is marred and

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, V. lvi. 6.

blotted out; and it becomes like to a dark thunder cloud, broken by fitful gleams and meteoric flashes, and driven on by violent winds, and rolling over our heads its loud and startling peals, in wild and terrible confusion.

To sum up the contrast in its main characteristics :

The system of Calvin represents man's salvation as no designed or desired end of God's work; nay, rather man's perdition is God's aim and wish. But God declares in Holy Scripture that He, the *living God*, is (in desire) *the Saviour of all men*<sup>2</sup>, and *would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of His truth*<sup>3</sup>; and *that He willeth not the death of a sinner, but that all should come to repentance*<sup>4</sup>; and God even affirms by an oath, *As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked*<sup>5</sup>.

The system of Calvin represents Faith as a personal assurance felt by an individual that he himself is favoured by God; and it teaches that every one who feels this assurance is one of God's elect (who are very *few* in number compared with the reprobate), and can never fall. And thus it encourages a spirit of presumption and self-righteousness in those who can excite in their minds this feeling, and would plunge all others in despondency and despair. It infatuates the former with the reckless delusion that, whatever they do, they cannot sin; and it would paralyze all others with a foreboding panic, that however they may labour after holiness, they are inevitably doomed to destruction.

But God in Scripture says, *Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall*<sup>6</sup>; and, *I will look to him that is of a poor and contrite spirit, that trembleth at*

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 4.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 2.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Pet. iii. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Cor. x. 12.

*my word* <sup>7</sup>; He prefers the fear of the Publican to the confidence of the Pharisee, and he says, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments* <sup>8</sup>.

The system of Calvin represents God as creating Adam in order that he might fall; and thus it would make God Himself to be the author of sin.

It regards Man as unable to receive or refuse Divine Grace, and thus destroys his freedom, and makes the offer of grace a mockery, and the sin of refusing it to be no sin, and all the Scriptural reproofs for sin, and all the encouragements to holiness, to be but idle tales, and the punishment for such refusal to be a despotic act of cruelty and injustice.

But God in Scripture says, *Behold, I have set before you life and death; therefore choose life: and he that willeth, let him take of the water of life freely* <sup>9</sup>. And, *Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings, cease to do evil* <sup>1</sup>.

The system of Calvin asserts that Christ's death is only available to those who imagine themselves to be accepted by God.

But God declares that *Christ tasted death for every man*.

The system of Calvin represents the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, not as the means instituted by Christ for the remission of sins, and for the effectual conveyance of regenerating grace, nor even as a sign of that conveyance to all, but only to some unknown few; and these few are not recipients of that grace by Baptism. And yet this system does not and cannot distinguish these few from other recipients; and so it makes Baptism to be a Sacrament without grace, and a sign without significance <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. lxvi. 2. Luke xviii. 14.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. xix. 17.

<sup>9</sup> Deut. xi. 26—28. Rev. xxii. 17.

<sup>1</sup> Isa. i. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Gerhard, Loc. Theol. iv. 511, thus exhibits the Calvinistic

But Scripture teaches that Christ comes by *water and blood*; *not by water only, but by water and blood*<sup>3</sup>. And they who shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, *have been born again of water and of the Spirit*<sup>4</sup>; and it therefore calls Baptism the *Laver of Regeneration*, or bath of the new birth *by which God saves us*<sup>5</sup>, teaching that *by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body*<sup>6</sup>, *the mystical body of Christ*, and that *we are washed, we are sanctified, we are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus*<sup>7</sup>, and that *as many of us as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ*<sup>8</sup>.

You have now the evidence before you.

On one side is the doctrine of Scripture; on the other, is the system of Calvin.

This much at least is clear:—If our Baptismal Offices are Calvinistic, they can hardly be regarded as Scriptural; and if those Offices are Scriptural, they ought not to be called Calvinistic.

Whether they are Calvinistic or Scriptural, is a question which must now be reserved for consideration at another opportunity.

opinions on the Sacrament of Baptism: “*Infantes Christianorum ante Baptismum sunt in fœdere gratiæ, nec tamen omnes, sed illi solum qui absoluto Dei decreto sunt electi. Reliqui, licet millies baptizentur, non regenerantur, cum baptismus non sit efficax medium sed signum et symbolum regenerationis, idque tantum in electis: Regeneratio autem illa non in baptismo fit: ideo de salute infantum non potest certi quidquam ex Baptismo statui.*”

<sup>3</sup> 1 John v. 5, 6.

<sup>4</sup> John iii. 3.

<sup>5</sup> λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας. Tit. iii. 5. So Eph. v. 25, 26. ἡγάπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς· ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι, i.e. having purified the Church by the bath of the baptismal waters, made efficacious by His Divine Word for the work of Regeneration, or new Creation, just as the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters (Gen. ii. 2), in order to the work of the old Creation.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. vi. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Gal. iii. 27.

## SERMON V.

---

WHETHER THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES ADMIT A HYPOTHETICAL SENSE.

---

ISAIAH XXXV. 8.

*And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called  
The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it: the  
wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.*

IN the last Discourse<sup>1</sup> we entered upon an enquiry with respect to the right Interpretation of the Baptismal Offices of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. It has been alleged by some, that the Framers of those Offices held the peculiar tenets of Calvin, with regard to Election, Predestination, and Final Perseverance; and it has been inferred, that they must *therefore* be supposed to have believed that the grace of Regeneration could only be conveyed in Baptism to such Children as had been specially *elected* from Eternity, by the free, irresistible, and indefectible Grace of God. Accordingly, it has been argued, the compilers of our Ritual could not have intended that the Baptismal Formularies, which they drew up, should be construed to convey a belief that Infants *generally* are born again in the Sacrament of Baptism. Such a construction as this,

<sup>1</sup> Preached in Westminster Abbey, April 14, 1850.

it has been affirmed, is opposed to their known principles; and, by consequence, is scarcely reconcilable with the dictates of equity and reason; and the *hypothetical* sense (as it is called), *i.e.* the sense which leaves it *uncertain*, whether the baptized Infant has been regenerated by baptism, or no, is the sense in which the Baptismal Offices ought to be understood.

With the view of ascertaining the soundness of these allegations, on this momentous matter, we have already enquired;

i. What is the Doctrine of HOLY SCRIPTURE concerning Predestination, Election, and Final Perseverance?

ii. What is the teaching of Calvin on these subjects?

And these questions having been resolved, we are now in a condition to examine,

iii. Whether the Baptismal Offices of the CHURCH of ENGLAND may be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense, or, (as the question would be more correctly stated,) whether they were framed by persons holding Calvinistic opinions, and whether they may be interpreted in a *hypothetical* sense, which has been *called Calvinistic*?

I. Let us first divest ourselves of all previous knowledge with regard to the History of these Offices. Let us not consider the Framers of the Prayer Book; but let us receive the Book itself into our hands. It is no ordinary Volume. It is "the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, and Administration of the SACRAMENTS of the CHURCH of ENGLAND." It is a Book designed for the public use of a Nation in the exercise of religious worship in the House of God.

Every sentence, therefore, which it contains must, we should suppose, have been well weighed: we cannot willingly entertain a suspicion that the Framers of the English Prayer Book should have been so untrue to



themselves, to us, and to God, as to use ambiguous words in solemn supplications, and to say one thing with their lips, while they harboured another in their hearts.

Even in the interpretation of *civil* Enactments, the Intention of the Lawgiver must be inferred from his received Laws, and not his Laws interpreted from his supposed Intentions. How much more ought this to be the case with Public Liturgies and Articles of Faith<sup>2</sup>.

Again; even a heathen<sup>3</sup> poet says, that he deserves eternal execration, who speaks one thing and hides another in his mind. And shall we make such a notion as this the groundwork of interpreting the Book of Common Prayer designed for the use of the People of England, distinguished, as we trust it is, by honesty and plainness of speech? Shall we do such discredit, as this principle would require, to those who bequeathed us the sacred inheritance of our religious Ritual? And when we learn *who they* were, who were instrumental in framing it, Bishops, Martyrs, and Confessors of the Church, shall we be guilty of supposing that these holy men were dissemblers before God?

When we recollect also, that it was one of the main principles of the English Reformation, that the Public Worship of God ought to be in a tongue to be understood by all, and that the Offices of the Church were not composed only for the wealthy and learned, but for the poor and illiterate, for peasants and young children, shall we not say that every thing is clearly written there as with a sunbeam, that *he who runs may read it*. *The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein*<sup>4</sup>. The sense which a child would put on the

<sup>2</sup> Intentio inservire debet legibus, non leges intentioni. Coke Litt. 314.

<sup>3</sup> Homer's Iliad, ix. 312.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. xxxv. 8.

Baptismal Offices, that, let us be sure, is the true sense. Yes; here at least every thing is frank, open, and sincere: any suspicion of evasion, equivocation, prevarication, or dissimulation, is not to be tolerated. Cast it far from you. The Framers of the Book of Common Prayer have said what they intended, and they intended what they have said.

The whole form of the allegation, therefore, ought to be changed. The objectors ought not to be allowed to say,—The Framers of the Prayer Book were Calvinists, and therefore the Prayer Book is Calvinistic. But they ought to prove, if they can, that the Prayer Book is Calvinistic; and then it will indeed follow, that its Framers held the tenets of Calvin.

II. Another preliminary consideration is here requisite.

The History of the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER is briefly this. Much of it is derived directly from Holy Scripture. Very many of its Collects and Prayers, Versicles and Suffrages, are literally translated from the Liturgies of the Primitive Church. It appeared first in its vernacular form in the year 1549; it reappeared in a revised shape in 1552; and again, somewhat modified, in 1559. The two former of these Editions are commonly called the First and Second Service Book of King Edward the Sixth. The third is the Service Book of Queen Elizabeth<sup>5</sup>. It underwent another revision at the commencement of the reign of King James I. in 1604, and was finally established in its present form soon after the Restoration of King Charles II., in the year 1662.

You perceive, then, that the composition of the Prayer Book is not to be limited to one particular

<sup>5</sup> A Latin Translation of this Book was published in 1560, and enjoined to be used in the Universities.

period; but it extends over many centuries. And if the Intentions of its Framers is to be our guide in interpreting it, we must follow the same course as we should do with regard to a civil document. In construing a Legislative Enactment, we should look to the opinions of those who gave it *full* and *final* validity. So it should be with the Book of Common Prayer. It now rests for its *spiritual* sanction (as its Preface<sup>6</sup> announces) on the authority of the Church in Convocation assembled at the Restoration; and its *civil* authority is derived from the Act of Uniformity<sup>7</sup> of that Period. If therefore the opinions of its Framers are to direct us, we must be regulated by the intentions of those who put the finishing stroke to the work in the year 1662, and delivered into our hands the Book of Common Prayer such as we have it at this day.

We shall apply this consideration hereafter, when we come to consider the *external evidence* on this Question. We now confine ourselves to *internal evidence*; and we shall proceed to examine whether the language of the Baptismal Offices is compatible with Calvinistic opinions.

Let us commence with the *Rubric* annexed to the Office of Public Baptism.

I begin with referring to a *Rubric*, because it has been alleged that the language of *Devotion* is not to be taken literally, and that the *Prayers* in these Offices are composed in a spirit of comprehensive generality.

<sup>6</sup> The Preface to the Book of Common Prayer was written in 1661, by Dr. Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln. (See his *Life* by Isaac Walton, p. 328.) "We have good hope that what is here presented, (*i. e.* the Book of Common Prayer,) and hath been by the Convocation of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

<sup>7</sup> 13 and 14 Car. II. c. 4.

But such a supposition as this cannot apply to a *Rubric*, and especially to one so worded as that before us.

In it we read as follows:

“It is certain, by God’s word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.”

In the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth we read, “It is certain, by God’s word, that Children *being baptized*, if they depart out of this life in their infancy, are undoubtedly saved.” In the Second Prayer Book of King Edward, and in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, this Rubric stands thus: “It is certain by God’s word that Children, *being baptized*, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved.” And in Queen Elizabeth’s *Latin* Prayer Book, printed in 1560<sup>8</sup>, and enjoined to be used in Schools and Universities, it is said, “*Pueros post Baptismum habere omnia necessaria ad salutem*,” *i.e.* that “Children *after their Baptism* have all things necessary for their salvation.”

Here then we have an unanimous affirmation from the Framers of the English Liturgy, in every stage of its progress at the Reformation, that *all* Children who are *baptized* and die in their infancy are saved<sup>9</sup>. If Calvinism had ever found its way into our Baptismal

<sup>8</sup> And reprinted by the Parker Society, Cambridge 1847. See Preface, p. xxvii. “This (*Latin*) Prayer Book was enjoined by the Queen’s authority on the Universities, the great Schools, and the Clergy in their private devotions.”

<sup>9</sup> Richard Baxter truly says (*Life*, p. 428), “Children (in this Rubric) is equal to *all* children. The indefinite here, according to common speech, is equivalent to an universal. Your conscience must tell you, that if you limit it to *some* only, you cross the sense of the compilers of the Liturgy. I am sure Dr. Gunning, who brought it in, hath publicly expressed his sense for the salvation of *all* such Infants.”

Offices, it must have done so on the occasion of one or other of the revisions of the Prayer Book at these several periods. And it is clear that this Rubric, involving as it does a most important question of doctrine, must have undergone careful consideration at each of those periods; as indeed is obvious enough from the nice, and almost scrupulous, *verbal* modifications, which it underwent, until it arrived at its present form.

Let us therefore now enquire, Can this Rubric be reconciled with Calvinistic tenets? Can it be understood in a Calvinistic sense?

It asserts unequivocally, that *all* baptized Infants, dying in their infancy, are saved. It implies also that they are saved by God's grace given them *in Baptism*. These are two distinct propositions, and it may be confidently affirmed that neither of them is compatible with Calvinistic opinions, and that both of them are directly opposed to those tenets. They contravene the fundamental principles of Calvinism.

To be convinced of this, you need only be reminded of Calvin's words, "All men are not created on equal terms; but to *some* of them eternal life is preordained, and to *others* eternal condemnation. Almighty God created certain persons for shame in life, and for perdition in death, and they are born from their mother's womb devoted to inevitable destruction<sup>1</sup>."

Such is Calvin's language.

Now hear the Church of England.

"It is certain by God's word that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved."

If the Church of England could speak, what would she say, when she heard that some of her children had

<sup>1</sup> See above, Sermon IV. pp. 87. 89.

openly affirmed that her Baptismal Offices may be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense, and that such is their reasonable, equitable, and charitable Interpretation?

Next, as to the second proposition. "Children who are *baptized* are undoubtedly *saved*," or, as it is expressed in the Second Prayer Book of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth, "Children being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved."

What was the teaching of Calvin on this point? Did *he* connect *Baptism* with certainty of *salvation*? By no means. He held that those Children who have been *elected* from eternity by the free grace of God, are saved; and they *alone*; and he taught that the *elect* bear a very small proportion to the reprobate<sup>2</sup>; and that those Infants, who are to be saved, are saved by ante-baptismal regeneration; but that their salvation is no way connected with the Sacrament of Baptism<sup>3</sup>.

Contrast such sentiments as these with the clear and authoritative judgment of the Church of England in the Rubric before us.

And yet it is alleged by some, that our Baptismal Offices were composed by Calvinists; and that this Rubric is to be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense; and it is therefore to mean that *some* infants, who die in their infancy, are saved.

What would our forefathers have said to such an interpretation as this? What would have been the astonishment of Archbishop Cranmer, and Bishop Ridley, who, under God's Providence, were the main instruments in framing the English Book of Common Prayer in the reign of King Edward the Sixth,—what would have been the honest indignation of Archbishop Parker and his brother Prelates who promulgated it

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 91.

anew at the accession of Queen Elizabeth,—what would have been the sorrow of the venerable Archbishop Juxon, Bishop Sanderson, and of all the assembled members of the Convocation of both Provinces, who, with “one assent and consent, brought it to its present form, and received it, and approved it, and subscribed<sup>4</sup> their hands to it” at the Restoration, if they could have foreseen that the words of comfort, drawn from the Holy Scriptures, by which they sought to console the hearts of sorrowing parents, and by which they assured them that God had wiped the tears from their eyes, and that their tender Infant, having been quickened and refreshed by the Holy Spirit with the early dews of Baptismal Grace, was sleeping sweetly in the arms of Christ,—should be wrested aside from their natural meaning, and be made to bear a contrary sense, exposing them to the grave charge of profanely abusing God’s Word, and of speaking in terms of cruel irony and bitter mockery to the afflicted mourners,—whom they designed to soothe?

II. It has been alleged by some, that Regeneration in baptism depends upon God’s *foresight* of *future* faith in the baptized Infant: and that consequently those Infants only are regenerate, in whom God foresees such future faith: and that *therefore* the Baptismal Office is to be understood in an *hypothetical sense*.

This error also is refuted by the Church declaring in

<sup>4</sup> The words are “LIBRUM PRECUM PUBLICARUM Nos Gulielmus Providentiâ Divinâ Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus et Nos Episcopi ejusdem Provinciæ et in sacrâ Provinciali Synodo legitime congregati, *unanîmî assensu et consensu* in hanc formam redeimus, recepimus, approbavimus, eique subscripsimus, 21 Dec., 1661.” Then follow the signatures of the Bishops and of the Lower House; then the same form is repeated in the Province of York. See Bishop Gibson’s Synodus Anglic. p. 95, and Nicholls’ Preface to Common Prayer, ed. 1712, p. xi.

the Rubric before us that “baptized children, dying in their Infancy, are undoubtedly saved.”

In order to *believe*, an Infant must *live*; and if it *dies* immediately after its Baptism, then, what God foresaw was its *death*, and not its *faith*. Yet it is regenerate and saved. Therefore, the Regeneration of baptized Infants does not depend on their post-baptismal faith, but on God’s baptismal grace.

III. Let us proceed to examine now the BAPTISMAL OFFICE itself.

It opens with a declaration that “All men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith that none can enter into the Kingdom of God *except* he be *Regenerate*.” The Church then proceeds to pray that the Infant now “coming to God’s Holy Baptism, may *receive* remission of sins by spiritual Regeneration.” And again: “Give Thy Holy Spirit to this Infant, that he may be born again.” Therefore the Infant is regarded as *not* Regenerate *before* Baptism; and is to be *made* Regenerate *by* Baptism.

After these prayers, and an Exhortation, in which the Church says, “Doubt ye not, but earnestly believe that God will favourably receive this present Infant;” and a stipulation from its sureties, the Infant is baptized with water, in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Then the Church declares by the mouth of her Minister, “Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child *is* *Regenerate* ;” or, as the words stand in the Office for the public reception into the Church of children baptized privately, “This child being born in original sin, *is* now *by* the Laver of *Regeneration in Baptism* received into the number of the children of God.” And again: “Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this Child *is by Baptism Regenerate*, and grafted into the Body of Christ’s Church,



let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits:" and she therefore proceeds to say, "We yield Thee most hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it *hath* pleased thee to *Regenerate* this Infant with Thy Holy Spirit."

The Church, therefore, affirms that an unbaptized infant is unregenerate; and that an infant being baptized, is made Regenerate thereby; and she thanks Almighty God for its Regeneration. And after an Exhortation to the sureties, the work is complete; and the Office ends.

Such, then, is her language in administering the Sacrament of Baptism, in the presence of God and of His People. Such is her language concerning *each* infant, who is severally brought to her for baptism. The solemn nature of this Holy Rite demanded of her plainness of speech; and, let me appeal to you, my brethren, has she *failed* in her duty? Could she have spoken more clearly than she has done? What think you?

No, assuredly, she could not.

Yet, alas! as the Psalmist said of himself, so she may now say of herself, *They daily mistake my words*<sup>5</sup>. *They stop their ears, and refuse to hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely*<sup>6</sup>. And as the Prophet complained, so may she complain, *Then said I, Ah, Lord God, they say of me, Doth she not speak parables*<sup>7</sup>. And as her Divine Lord said of Himself, *We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness*<sup>8</sup>.

So it has now come to pass in these degenerate days, that though the Church of England has *not* failed

<sup>5</sup> Ps. lvi. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Ezek. xx. 49.

<sup>6</sup> Ps. lviii, 4, 5.

<sup>8</sup> John iii. 10.

in her duty, yet it is said by some, that she speaks with stammering lips and a faltering tongue; and her clear, strong, and solemn language, concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, has become to many like *sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal*<sup>9</sup>.

Willingly, most willingly, would I have abstained from all reference to such charges as these. But they have been publicly made, and must be publicly met. It has been confidently affirmed that out of a hundred infants to whom the Sacrament of Baptism is administered, there may be very few to whom more is administered than an outward rite and empty ceremony; and it has been asserted that the explicit declarations of the Church, concerning each Infant who is baptized, are *not* to be understood as conveying any *assurance* that the Infant *is* Regenerate by Baptism; but that they may be regarded only as *hypothetical*, *i. e.* only as expressing a hope that it *may be* so Regenerate; and that henceforth her People may be taught that they are not to imagine that the words, "Doubt ye not, but earnestly believe, that God will favourably receive this present Infant," express *any* confidence of such reception; and that the solemn declaration "Seeing this child *is* now regenerate," is not intended to intimate any firm persuasion that the child *is* Regenerate; and that when the Church thanks God, and calls on the Congregation to thank Him, that it *hath* pleased Him to regenerate the child, she thanks Him, and enjoins them to thank Him, for what in numerous cases has *never* been given, and for what in *no* case has been *certainly* given and *undoubtedly* received.

I do not intend to say, that they who assign this

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 1.

*hypothetical* sense to the words of the Church, do so with bad motives. But the fact is, that whatever may be their design, this hypothetical interpretation does involve a most grave charge against her. It amounts to nothing short of a formal accusation, that she speaks untruly in the solemn act of administering a Sacrament. For, if it is *not* certain in *any* case that Regeneration has been received, then it must be certain, that in *some* cases it cannot have been received. And, therefore, since the Church asserts that Regeneration *is* given and received in *every* case, she must be guilty of a falsehood in the sight of God, and in His solemn worship.

What, my beloved brethren, has the Church of England done, that she should be thus arraigned? What sin has she committed, that she should receive such cruel wounds *in the house of her friends*<sup>1</sup>? *It is not an open enemy that hath done her this dishonour. But some of her companions, her own familiar friends*<sup>2</sup>. *They also who did eat of her bread have laid great wait for her*<sup>3</sup>.

Thus have they embittered her life. But, now that she is thus vexed—now that she is thus misrepresented, through no fault of her own, but in spite of her most plain declarations—and now that her name is changed from Naomi to Marah, all faithful, true, and loving hearts will cleave to her more closely, more stedfastly, and more affectionately, like Ruth<sup>4</sup>.

*If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; yea, if I prefer not Jerusalem in my mirth*<sup>5</sup>.

However, it is now needful, that she should plead

<sup>1</sup> Zech. xiii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. lv. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. xli. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Ruth i. 14—21.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. cxxxvii. 5, 6.

with those of her children who bring this impeachment against her. What are its grounds? *Produce your cause, bring forth your strong reasons* <sup>6</sup>.

“Your Baptismal Offices” (they reply) “were framed by the Reformers, and they held the doctrines of Calvin with regard to Election and Predestination; therefore those Offices must be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense, that is, they must be supposed to mean that Regeneration in baptism can *only* result in the case of *those* Infants who have been Elected from eternity by the free sovereign grace of God.”

Such are the grounds for the allegation. Little, it may be supposed, do they who urge it perceive what a stigma would be fixed on the English Reformation, if this allegation were true. Many are the contumelies which have been heaped upon the Reformation by the emissaries of Rome. But what could its bitterest enemies devise more deadly against it, than this imputation of its friends, that the Church of England has been taught by the Reformers to be double-tongued in the Service of God; and that, in administering the Sacraments of Christ, *she has a lie in her right hand* <sup>7</sup>.

What a triumph for Rome, if this allegation were true! Then indeed it might be said, *The beauty of Israel is gone: how are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice* <sup>8</sup>.

But, God be thanked, it is *not* true: the very reverse is the truth.

It has already been shown, that the Rubric, at the close of the Baptismal Office, which asserts that “baptized children dying in their infancy are undoubtedly saved,” is a direct contradiction of the Calvinistic tenets with respect to Election and Reprobation, and is a

<sup>6</sup> Isa. xli. 21.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. xliv. 20.

<sup>8</sup> 2 Sam. i. 19, 20.

conclusive proof that the Framers of that Office taught a system of Theology opposed to that of Calvin in primary and paramount articles of the Christian Faith.

The Rubric speaks in definite terms; so does the Baptismal Office: and they are consistent with each other. The former does not admit the hypothetical sense: and, if words have power to convey the meaning of those who use them, the latter excludes it also. They are, therefore, not framed in a Calvinistic sense: and they ought not to be so construed.

IV. Nor is this all. Suppose, for argument's sake, that these words *might* be construed in a *hypothetical* sense: yet it is a great mistake to imagine that this *hypothetical* sense is a *Calvinistic* sense. Even if it were the true sense, it would not afford any ground for supposing that these Offices were composed by persons of Calvinistic opinions. Indeed it would prove the contrary. And they who argue that our Baptismal Offices may be interpreted in a *hypothetical* sense, *because* they were framed by Calvinists, have never carefully examined what Calvinism is.

Calvin did not imagine that *any* Infants were ever regenerate *by Baptism*. He supposed that only *elect* Infants are regenerated at all; and he taught that they are regenerated by *an invisible spiritual* process, wholly irrespective of that Sacrament. He would have protested *as* strongly against the *hypothetical* sense, as against the *absolute* sense. He would have been quite as ready to believe that *all* Infants are regenerate by Baptism, as that *any* are so<sup>9</sup>. But

<sup>9</sup> See the authorities cited above, pp. 90—92. 95, 96. Calvin says, Antidot. Art. Paris. p. 220 (Vol. vii. ed. Genev. 1617) "*Liberi fidelium non filii Dei per Baptismum fiunt.*"

It is more remarkable that this should not be known, because the orthodox Lutherans of Germany published certain Articles to

he denied *both* these propositions. How astonished therefore would Calvin have been, to hear from the lips of any of us, that these expressions in our Baptismal Offices must be understood in an hypothetical sense, because their framers were his disciples!

Thus you see, that, according to this allegation, our Baptismal Offices are to be wrested from their plain natural sense, to an unnatural and contra-natural one, in order that they may be reconciled with Calvinism, with which, when so distorted, they are wholly irreconcilable!

V. The next argument which requires notice is derived from the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES of the Church of England.

They, who would construe our Baptismal Offices in what *they call* a Calvinistic sense, reason as follows:—

The Baptismal Offices (they allow) taken by themselves, do not favour such a construction. But they say that Liturgical Formularies are not composed with rigorous exactness: they may be regarded as a *Code of Devotion*, but not as a *Rule of Faith*. Accordingly they must be interpreted by the more precise and severe language of the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES which

be subscribed by all their Clergy, Teachers, and Patrons of Churches, in which they condemn the following tenets “of the CALVINISTS as false and erroneous.”

1. “The tenet, that Baptism is only an external washing of water, by which an inward cleansing from sin is *signified*.”

2. “The tenet, that Baptism does *not confer* Regeneration, and the Grace of God, but is only a sign or seal of these things.”

3. “The tenet, that *Regeneration* does *not* take place in *Baptism*.”

Articuli Visitorii in Electoratu et Provinciis superioris Saxoniae publicati. Hase Libri Symbol. Eccl. Evang. p. 865, ed. Lips. 1837. Guericke says truly, that Calvin “*alle eigentliche Mittheilung göttlicher Gabe durch das Wasser der Taufe aufs verschiedenste leugnet*.” Symbolik, p. 462, ed. 1846.

constitute the *Law of Doctrine* of the Church. These Articles are framed (they allege) in a Calvinistic sense: consequently the Baptismal Offices must be so construed as to bear that sense.

It is a very invidious thing to confront one part of the Prayer Book with another. The caution of the wise man must here be heard and heeded, *Say not, this is worse than that; for in their time both shall be well approved*<sup>10</sup>.

But since this contrast has been drawn, we are compelled to observe, that in a certain sense, our Liturgical Formularies, and therefore the Baptismal Offices, possess fuller doctrinal authority and validity than the Thirty-nine Articles. This is clear from the fact, that the *Articles* are subscribed only by the *Clergy*, but the *Liturgy* is the general term of Communion for Clergy and Laity alike. It is obligatory upon all. The Articles are entitled "Articles of Religion, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions"<sup>11</sup>;

<sup>10</sup> Ecclus. xxxix. 34.

<sup>11</sup> Hence Bishop BULL thus speaks in his Vindication of the Church of England, vol. ii. p. 211, ed. Burton, 1827. "As for our being concluded by the ARTICLES, if he means our being obliged to give our internal assent to every thing delivered in them upon peril of damnation, it is confessed that few, yea none of us, that are well advised, will acknowledge ourselves so concluded by them, nor did our Church ever intend we should. For she professeth not to deliver *all* her Articles, *all* I said, for some are coincident with the fundamental points of Christianity, as *essentials of Faith*, without the belief whereof no man can be saved. But she only propounds them as a body of safe and pious principles *for the preservation of peace*, to be subscribed and not openly contradicted by her Sons. And, therefore, she requires subscription to them *only from the Clergy*, and *not from the Laity*, who yet are obliged to acknowledge all the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith. . . . This hath been often told the Papists by many learned writers of the Church." He then quotes Archbishop USHER and Bishop HALL, to that effect. I may add the following from Bishop JEBB,

and they contain sundry propositions not to be contradicted by the Clergy, but not imposed upon them as essential in the same way as the Liturgy is.

Whatever is contained in the Liturgy is for the daily use of all. Hence, therefore, all controverted or controvertible matters were studiously excluded from it, and nothing has been admitted into it which is not regarded by the Church as perfectly plain, and clear, and definitively settled, and as fit and necessary for all<sup>1</sup>. And how can we harbour for a moment the injurious and miserable suspicion, that the Church has dictated *Prayers* for our use of so equivocal and ambiguous a kind, that, in repeating them day after day, we should be playing the part of hypocrites in the public worship of God<sup>2</sup>?

Let me remind you also, that the interpretation, which we maintain to be the only true one of the Baptismal Office, is founded not only on the *Prayers* of that Office, but on its *Rubric* and (as might easily be shown) on the *Catechism*; to neither of which the observation with respect to *devotional* latitude can apply. Whatever, therefore, is contained in the Articles, will doubtless be found to be in perfect unison with that Interpretation.

recording the opinion of ALEXANDER KNOX, "He considered the LITURGY a much stronger fence to the Church than Subscription to the Articles. The latter was a *single act*, to which a man might argue down or persuade his scruples. But no Arian, who had a grain of religion or honesty, could persist week after week in reading the Creeds."—Preface to Burnet's *Lives*, ed. 1833, p. xxxviii.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 47, note 7.

<sup>2</sup> The argument drawn from the *Burial Service* is not dwelt upon, because it carries with it its own refutation. The Church there says, "our *hope* is, that our *brother* rests" in peace; and by so saying she shows, that *if* she had not been *sure* that Regeneration *is* given in Baptism, she *would* likewise have said, "our *hope* is, that this child is regenerate;" instead of which she says, "seeing now this child *is* regenerate."



Be it also remembered, that the Framers of the Baptismal Offices were also the Framers of the Articles; we receive them both from the same hands, and they were framed nearly at the same time. Whatever, then, is the undeniable sense of the Offices, is also the sense of the Articles; if the one were Calvinistic, the other would be so. But if the Offices, as we have seen, are plainly *opposed to Calvinism*, we may fairly argue from them that the Articles are not Calvinistic. Nor let it be forgotten, that, in the Royal Declaration prefixed to the Articles, a Rule is prescribed for their Interpretation. And what is that? Not that we should enquire, *what* were the opinions of their *Framers*,—not, that we should even know *who* their Framers were,—but that we should take the Articles in their “*plain and full meaning*,” and in their “*literal and grammatical sense*.”

Let us comply with this Rule, and turn to the Articles themselves.

1. The Eighth Article affirms, that “the Three Creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.”

One of these Creeds is the Nicene, and one of the Articles of that Creed is, “That for us men and for our Salvation, Christ came down from Heaven;” and the sense in which we understand this, is clearly manifested in the address of the Priest to *each* Communicant singly, “The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for *thee* ;” “The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for *thee* ;” showing that salvation is offered in Christ to *each* person in particular. But Calvin teaches that Christ did not die for all, but only for the elect.

Another of the Articles of that Creed is, “I believe

one Baptism for the remission of Sins," *i.e.* for the forgiveness of guilt, both original and actual. But Calvin did not teach that Sins are remitted through Baptism.

2. Refer now to the Ninth Article. We there read, that "The infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated . . . although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized." Let me call your attention here to the word "*baptized*." It so stands in our present English Edition of the Articles, which were promulgated in their vernacular form in 1562 and 1571. But we must remember that this English Form is a translation from the *Latin*, in which language the Articles were originally composed<sup>3</sup>. And if we turn to the Latin Original of the Article, we find, as the equivalent for the word *baptized*, the word *renatis*<sup>4</sup>. Hence we thus argue, not only that the Framers of our English Articles held and taught that they who are baptized are regenerate, but our argument is more than this: they went out of their way to mark their opinion. Having the word "*renatis*" before them, they did not translate it *literally*, "*born again*," but "*baptized*;" and thus showed, in the most striking manner, that they knew of *no* ordinary way of new birth, but by Baptism.

<sup>3</sup> The *Latin* Edition, 1552 and 1562, is the original Form of, and of equal authority with, our commonly received English Edition of the Articles, 1562 and 1571. See Bishop Burnet, and the Observations of Waterland, who quotes him, in Waterland's Works, vol. ii. p. 345, ed. Van Mildert, 1823.

<sup>4</sup> The clause stands thus in the Article:—

Latin 1552, "*renatis et credentibus*."

Engl. 1552, "them that believe and are baptized."

Latin 1562, "*renatis et credentibus*."

Engl. 1562, "them that believe and are baptized."

Latin 1571, "*renatis et credentibus*."

Engl. 1571, "them that believe and are baptized."

No person holding Calvinistic opinions could ever have made such a translation as that.

3. Let me now invite your attention to another Article, the Sixteenth. There it is most truly said, that "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace;" and that "They are to be condemned which say they can no more sin as long as they live here."

This again is opposed<sup>5</sup> to one of the fundamental Articles of the Calvinistic scheme. Calvin defines Faith to be the personal persuasion of an individual that he himself is accepted by God, and will be saved. And they who have once realized this belief, are, according to his doctrine, justified; and he says that they who are thus incorporated into Christ, can never fail of salvation<sup>6</sup>.

It is a well-known fact, that the English Calvinists of Queen Elizabeth's time assailed this Sixteenth Article, as (to quote their words) "speaking very dangerously of *falling from grace*."<sup>7</sup> And the Calvinists, at the accession of King James, laboured zealously for the alteration of this Article, but laboured in vain<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> As in the Doctrine of the HOMILY (1547), "of the declining from God;" and of the Nativity (1563). On the Anti-Calvinistic character of this Article, see also Bishop Bull, Apolog. pro Harmon. sect. vii. § 8—10, vol. iv. p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> See above, p. 88.

<sup>7</sup> Second Admonition to Parliament, p. 43, l. 30. They accuse some Bishops as suspected of the heresy of Pelagius, and they say, "for Free will not only *they* are suspected, but others also. And indeed the BOOK of ARTICLES speaketh *very dangerously* of falling from grace; which is to be reformed."

<sup>8</sup> At the Hampton Court Conference, 1604. See Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 178. 180. Oxf. 1840. They were withstood by Bancroft, Bishop of London, saying, "How many in these days, neglecting holiness of life, presume too much of persisting of grace, laying all their religion on Predestination. *If I shall be saved, I shall be saved,*" which he termed a desperate doctrine.

This Article therefore could not have been penned by Calvinists.

4. The Seventeenth Article treats specially of Predestination and Election; and, if the framers of the Articles held the peculiar doctrines of Calvin, here we may well expect to find them clearly expressed. Let us examine the case.

In this Article the Church very wisely begins with fixing her eyes upon Almighty God. She declares that Predestination is His work; and she regards this work as done, not arbitrarily, but "*constantly*;" that is, with calm and deliberate purpose, wisdom, and judgment, and by "counsel" not published to the world, but "secret to us." Hence, therefore, she teaches that no child of man *can* know his own future and final state. No one, therefore, should *presume*; and no one *ought to despair*.

Having laid down this principle, she then proceeds to declare that they, who are predestinate by God, "*walk religiously in good works*." She, therefore, now turns her eyes from God to man; and she encourages all *godly persons*<sup>9</sup> who "feel in themselves the *working* of the Spirit of Christ, *mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members*, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things," to cherish the joyful hope, "the sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort" of believing that they themselves are "endued with the excellent benefit" of God's favour and Election.

But then, on the other hand, lest *other* persons, who do *not* bring forth the fruits of the Spirit in their lives, should be deluded by some inward dream that they are dear Children of God, she goes on to warn them, by affirming, that "for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their

<sup>9</sup> "*Verè pios*."

eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation."

And she concludes the Article by saying that we must receive God's promises as they are set forth to us in Scripture, and that in our doings we must follow that will of God which is declared to us in the word of God.

What can be more reasonable, what more Scriptural, what more beautiful and profitable, than such language as this?

But how different is the system of Calvin<sup>10</sup>. He dwells upon God's *Will*, but he says nothing of His *Counsel*, His *Justice*, and His *Goodness*. In defiance of all these gracious attributes, he teaches that God, by an arbitrary *decree*, which Calvin himself calls *horrible*<sup>1</sup>, has created an infinite number of reasonable and immortal creatures, *in order* that they may be eternally miserable. And he defines Faith to be a firm and certain persuasion in the breast of the individual man, of God's eternal good-will not "*secret* to us" but

<sup>10</sup> It is remarkable that Bossuet *cites* this XVIIth Article as well as the IXth, to show that the Church of England holds *Anti-Calvinistic* tenets.—In his *Variations*, x. § 23, he thus speaks:—

"In one of these Articles (the IXth), the inamissibility of justification is rejected: in the other (the XVIIth), the certainty of Predestination seems quite excluded, for it is called 'a dangerous downfall'—which excludes that special certainty whereby each believer is obliged to believe in particular, that he is of the number of the Elect, and comprehended within that absolute decree by which God wills their salvation."

"The XVIIth Article (says the Bishop of St. Asaph, *History of the Church*, s. 484), was derived from the *German School* of Theology, not from Calvin." The Bishop cites a remarkable parallel to it from Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 89.

revealed to the person himself. Let a man only realize this personal assurance—and any one of a sanguine, presumptuous, and enthusiastic temperament may readily realize it—and he *cannot fail of salvation*.

Such is his doctrine<sup>2</sup>, and if that doctrine be true, then a person who *cannot* persuade himself that he himself is a *special object* of God's favour, (and what truly humble, pious, and contrite man ever did, or ever could?) he must necessarily fear that, not being elect, (since there is no other alternative,) he himself *must be reprobate*, and so he will sink into despair.

Again. The Article says, that “for *curious and carnal persons*, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have before their eyes continually the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall.” But, according to Calvin, it is the very essence of Christianity to realize this sentence of God's Predestination of ourselves to eternal life. And they who *have* realized it, according to him, are not *curious and carnal persons*; no, they are *godly and pious*, they are God's Elect, they are His dear children, they are under the influence of His irresistible and indefectible Grace, and whatever they say or do, they cannot fail of Salvation.

Hence it is very evident, that this Article also was not framed by disciples of Calvin<sup>3</sup>.

5. The Twenty-fifth and two following Articles con-

<sup>2</sup> See above, pp. 87, 88.

<sup>3</sup> Bishop BANCROFT well contrasts the true doctrine with the Calvinistic tenets, in his excellent remarks at Hampton Court Conference, 1604. “We should reason rather *ascendendo* than *descendendo*: thus; I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbour, I follow my vocation, *therefore* I *trust* that God hath elected me to Salvation—and not thus, God hath predestinated and chosen me to life, *therefore* though I sin never so grievously, yet I shall not be damned; for whom He once loveth He loveth to the end.”—Cardwell's Conferences, p. 180.

And yet Bishop Bancroft also has been accused of being a Calvinist.

cern the Christian Sacraments. The Church there teaches that Sacraments are not mere badges or tokens, but are effectual Signs or Seals of Grace, by which God *works* upon us<sup>4</sup> to quicken, strengthen, and confirm our Faith<sup>5</sup>. They are, therefore, *Means of Grace*: and Baptism is called the Sign or Seal of the new birth, by which Sign, "as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of Forgiveness of Sin, and of our Adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." You have been already reminded that, in the Ninth Article, the Latin word *renatis* is rendered into English by *baptized*, and that, therefore, the Church, in her Articles, declares those who are baptized to be regenerate, and that the ordinary means of Regeneration are to be sought in the Sacrament of Baptism.

But Calvin taught that only the Elect are regenerate, and that they are not regenerate by baptism. Hence these Articles are against the tenets of Calvin.

6. The Thirty-first Article affirms, that "the offering of Christ is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for *all* the Sins of the *Whole World*, both original and actual." But, according to Calvin, a vast majority of mankind was created *in order* to be condemned eternally<sup>6</sup>: so that, according to him, Christ did not die for the Sins of all, but only for a few.

This Article, therefore, also, was framed by Persons who differed widely from Calvin.

It is, therefore, clear, on the whole, that the peculiar

<sup>4</sup> Latin "in nos."

<sup>5</sup> Per quæ (Deus) invisibiliter Ipse *in nos operatur*, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.—Art. XXV. Latin Articles, 1571.

<sup>6</sup> See above, pp. 87. 89.

tenets of Calvin are not taught in the Articles, any more than they are embodied in the Liturgy<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Under the circumstances of the present day, the reader will not regret to see the above conclusion confirmed by the authority of one of the most learned and sober-minded Divines of the Church of England.

In his supplement to the case of Arian Subscription, Dr. WATERLAND thus writes (vol. ii. p. 375):—

“For my own part, I think it has been abundantly proved that our Articles and Liturgy are not Calvinistical.” He then discusses the history of the Lambeth Articles: observing p. 377, that “HOOKER at the Temple in 1585, condemned absolute Reprobation; Dr. BARO at Cambridge determined in the Schools against the Calvinian tenets for fourteen years before.” (P. 378.) “The Lambeth Articles, in their strictest sense, appeared to some not very consistent with the doctrine of our Church. It is very well known that the Queen and the Court disliked them; that they thought them destructive of piety and government . . . Archbishop Usher some years after renounced his Calvinian principles (p. 381).” (See also Collier, Ch. Hist., ii. p. 868.) But I do not find that he therewith renounced our Articles. (P. 380.) “OVERALL, Harsnet, Clayton, and ANDREWES favoured BARO and his cause.”

(P. 381.) “It has often been pleaded by learned men, and I think well proved, that our Articles (in the year 1552) were not drawn up by Calvin’s scheme, but, next to Scripture and Antiquity, upon the platform of the moderate Lutherans, the Augustan Confession, Melancthon’s Doctrine, and the ‘Necessary Doctrine,’ and ‘Erudition of a Christian Man,’ compiled about nine years before the passing of our Articles, and by many of the same hands that concurred with these in 1552. Our Articles, therefore, in their original composition, were *not Calvinistical*: how they could come to be so afterwards, being still the same Articles, I cannot devise. I do not find that the Calvinian rigours had obtained here in King Edward’s time, except among the *Gospellers* (as they were then called), who were a scandal to the doctrine they professed, as Bishop Burnet says of them; and who were often smartly reflected on by Hooper, and other the most judicious Reformers. The refugees from Geneva, in Queen Elizabeth’s days, began to propagate Calvinism pretty early; but it does not appear that they then claimed any countenance for it from our *Articles*; which still continued the same in those points after the revival in 1562, and again in 1571.



Let us here pause, and review what has now been under consideration.

At the commencement of the last Discourse, your attention was drawn to an allegation affecting the character of our Baptismal Offices, and of those venerable persons by whom they were framed. It has been confidently averred, that the Framers of those Offices, who lived at the period of the Reformation in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, and at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, held the peculiar tenets of Calvin as to Predestination, Election, and Final Perseverance. Thence it has been argued, that they intended to propound those tenets in the Formularies, which they drew up. And by consequence, it has been alleged, that they who interpret those Formularies in a Calvinistic sense, approach nearest to the mind of their Framers: and, specially, they who regard the language of the Church in the Offices for Baptism of Infants, concerning Regeneration by Baptism, as spoken only *hypothetically*, that is as expressing only a *hope*, and not a firm persuasion that such Regeneration has been effected in Baptism, are warranted in such an Interpretation.

You were then invited to consider the Doctrine of Holy Scripture, concerning Predestination, Election, and Final Perseverance.

In the year 1572, the Calvinists themselves complain of some of our Bishops, as also of the *Articles*."

(P. 382.) "The Calvinists, at that time, were very far from boasting of our *Articles* being clear on their side: they suspected the very contrary, being sensible how the doctrines of *universal redemption*, and of *departing from grace*, bore hard upon their scheme."

(P. 383.) "In the years 1584 and 1585, we find Mr. Harsnet and the judicious HOOKER, condemning the Calvinistic doctrine of irrelative reprobation, and both countenanced by Archbishop Whitgift."

(P. 386.) "The Article of Predestination has been vainly enough urged in favour of the Calvinian Scheme."

You were next desired to compare this teaching with that of Calvin on the same subjects, as propounded in his own words.

The fundamental differences between the doctrine of Scripture and the system of Calvin were then pointed out.

We then approached the question, Whether the Baptismal offices of the Church of England could be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense.

It was laid down as an undeniable principle, that the Framers of our Public Prayers must be supposed to say what they mean, and to mean what they say: and it would be a grave injustice to those venerable Bishops and Martyrs, to the English Reformation, and to the English Church and Nation, to imagine that expressions used in the Administration of the Sacraments of Christ in the House of God, are to be understood in any other sense but the plain, simple, and obvious one.

It was therefore stated, that the whole form of the allegation ought to be changed. They who prefer the objection, ought not to argue that the Framers of the Prayer Book were Calvinists, and that therefore the Prayer Book is Calvinistic. But they ought to prove that the Book of Common Prayer is Calvinistic, and then it would follow, that the Framers of the Prayer Book were Calvinists.

An observation was here introduced to this effect, that even supposing the Framers of the Prayer Book at the Reformation to have been Calvinists, yet that this would not prove that the Prayer Book, such as we have it now, is to be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense; for we receive the Book of Common Prayer, such as it now exists, on the authority of those who *finally* received and promulgated it; that is, ecclesiastically, on the authority of the Church in Convocation at the Restoration; and civilly, on that of the Act of Uni-

formity passed at the same period. If therefore the intention of Framers is to regulate us in our interpretation, we must look to *them* for guidance.

This consideration being reserved for further development hereafter, we then examined the concluding Rubric of the Office for Infant Baptism; we considered the Prayers, Exhortations, and Thanksgivings of the same Formularies; we found that their language is clear, consistent, and uniform; and wholly at variance with the primary and paramount principles of the Calvinistic System.

It was observed also that, *according to that system*, Regeneration is *never* effected *by* the Sacrament of Baptism, and that therefore, supposing that the expressions concerning Regeneration by Baptism are to be understood *hypothetically* (which is opposed to their plain drift), yet that this is *opposed* to Calvin's tenets quite as much as the *absolute* sense; and that therefore the allegation that the Framers of the Offices were Calvinists, and that consequently these expressions are to be interpreted *hypothetically*, affords an additional proof that they who charge the Church with Calvinism, have not ascertained what Calvinism is.

The question was then considered, whether the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES are, in any respect, at variance with the Liturgical Offices. It was observed that fundamental matters,—such as the Doctrine of the Sacrament of Baptism,—are the proper subject-matter of the Liturgy; and not only do the *Clergy* give “their assent<sup>s</sup> and consent to the Liturgy,” but it is the term of Communion for all, *both* Clergy and Laity; whereas the Thirty-nine Articles, as propounded by the Church, are to be subscribed by the

<sup>s</sup> Act of Uniformity, § 4.

Clergy *alone*. Therefore, in these Fundamentals, nothing can set aside the plain sense of the Baptismal Offices. And that sense, it was shown, is not at variance, but in perfect unison with the Articles, which were proved to be wholly irreconcilable with the tenets of Calvin.

For these reasons, we conclude, that the plain sense of the Baptismal Offices is to be maintained, as the only true one; and that the hypothetical sense is to be rejected, as erroneous and untenable.

This conclusion will be fortified by other considerations in a subsequent Discourse.

In the mean time, let me commend the following words of one of our greatest Divines, one of our most powerful Champions against the Church of Rome,—one whose mortal remains repose near this spot within these sacred walls,—to your serious meditation, as specially appropriate at the present time:—

“The Apostles at first<sup>9</sup>, and the Church ever since after them, (except some heterodox people of late,) have professed readily to confer Holy Baptism, and therein to dispense remission of Sins, together with other Evangelical graces and privileges, to *every man* professing his faith in Christ, and resolution to observe Christ’s law, upon the supposition that Christ is the Saviour of all such, and by His salutary Passion hath purchased remission for them. . . .

“That in thus doing, the Church proceeds upon a persuasion, that Christ is truly the Saviour of *all its visible* members, duly admitted and incorporated thereinto, the thing itself plainly signifies; the tenor of its prac-

<sup>9</sup> Dr. Barrow on Universal Redemption.—Serm. XXXIX. vol. iii. pp. 449, 450, ed. 1686.

tice makes palpable ; the forms of speech used in its Holy Administrations of Prayers, of Sacraments, of Exhortations, do suppose or express.

“For how can *each member singly* be asserted in HOLY BAPTISM to be *washed from his Sins*, and *made regenerate* or adopted into the number of God’s children, and made partaker of Christ’s Death?—how can Thanksgiving in the common name be in most general terms offered up for Christ’s saving performances;—how can the Holy Bread and Cup be imparted to *each* Communicant as symbols and pledges of Christ’s charity and mercy toward him;—how can *every* Christian be instigated to obedience and gratitude to Christ,—and those who transgress Christ’s laws be upbraided for their ingratitude toward Him;—their rejecting, or renouncing, despising or abusing, Him and His salvation—how can such things be said and done with *any truth and consistency, yea without forgery and mockery*, if *every baptized* Christian hath not an interest in our Lord’s performances, and if Christ be the Saviour only of *an uncertain and unknown part* in the Church?” . . .

He then cites the following decree of the Bishops assembled at the Council of Valentia<sup>1</sup> :—

“‘We do believe it most firmly to be held that all the multitude of the faithful, being regenerated by water and the Holy Spirit, and thereby truly incorporated into the Church, and according to the Apostolical doctrine baptized into the death of Christ, is by His blood washed from their sins.’

“In the Sacraments of the Church, *there is nothing empty or vain, nothing ludificatory*. But all is thoroughly true, and supported by its own very truth and sincerity.”

<sup>1</sup> A.D. 855, Can. V. Labbe Concil. viii. 137.

He then adds the following caution. "Out of that company of Believers and Redeemed some are eternally saved, because, by God's grace, they faithfully abide in their redemption, bearing the Lord's speech in their hearts, *he that perseveres to the end shall be saved*<sup>2</sup>; and others, because they would not abide in the salvation of the faith which they at first received, and did rather choose to frustrate the grace of redemption by evil doctrine or life, than to keep it, do in nowise arrive at the plenitude of salvation, and to the perception of eternal beatitude."

May God in his mercy grant that we may never receive His grace in vain, but may so cherish and improve the heavenly gift, that we may make *our calling and election sure*<sup>3</sup>, through JESUS CHRIST *our Lord. Amen.*

<sup>2</sup> Matt. x. 22.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Pet. i. 10.

## SERMON VI.<sup>1</sup>

---

WHETHER THE BAPTISMAL OFFICES WERE FRAMED BY  
CALVINISTS.

---

2 TIM. i. 14.

*That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy  
Ghost Which dwelleth in us.*

THE blessings of Nature which are most common, are also most valuable, and are generally least appreciated. It requires the intervention of a Pestilence, to convince us adequately of the privilege which we enjoy in pure air and healthful seasons. The same also is true in the world of Grace. We do not estimate duly our spiritual privileges, till they are assailed. It is from persecution that we learn to value peace; and it is from the dissemination of heretical novelties, that we obtain a full knowledge of the value of sound doctrine.

One of the greatest benefits which it has pleased Divine Providence to vouchsafe to our Church and Nation, is the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. But, in times of tranquillity we are too prone to forget how great this blessing is. It is only when controversies arise, and when we appear to be in danger of losing a portion of the sacred treasure which is stored there,

<sup>1</sup> Preached in Westminster Abbey, April 21, 1850.

that we awake to a right sense of thankfulness for this pure *form of sound words*, this *good thing committed to us by the Holy Ghost*, with which Almighty God has blessed us for three hundred years.

Such is the condition in which we now find ourselves placed. We hear it affirmed, that the Formularies of the Book of Common Prayer, and especially her Baptismal Offices, were framed by persons who held Calvinistic Tenets; and that they may be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense.

Knowing what Calvinistic Tenets are, and (as you have been already reminded by an appeal first to Scripture and then to the Works of Calvin<sup>2</sup>), that they cannot be reconciled with the pure Word of God, we are filled with alarm at such a declaration as this: and we begin to feel as if the ground beneath us were no longer safe. We are therefore constrained to enquire, whether this assertion be true?

We had imagined, that we were familiar from our infancy with the language of the Prayer Book, but we examine it again and again: we scan the words of its Baptismal Offices with a scrutinizing eye, we weigh each phrase of its Articles with scrupulous anxiety, and we thank God, that, after the most careful investigation, we cannot discover any trace of those dangerous doctrines which were propagated by Calvin through the world, and which appear to us to be inconsistent with the revealed attributes of God, and to be fraught with pernicious consequences to the virtue and happiness of man.

Such was the conclusion to which we were brought at the termination of the last Discourse.

But the argument is not closed.

The examination of *internal evidence* (we are informed)

<sup>2</sup> See above, Sermon iv. pp. 71—96.



is not sufficient: we must deal with *external* evidence also.

True, (it is said,) the language of the Formularies of the Prayer Book, considered by themselves, may not suggest a Calvinistic sense. But *by whom* (it is asked) were those Formularies framed? Were they not compiled by persons holding Calvinistic opinions? Did not they *intend* that we should receive them in a Calvinistic sense? And may we frustrate their intentions? Is this a fit recompence for their labour and zeal? No. Let us identify ourselves with them. We accept what they give us; let us receive it according to the sense in which it is given.

Such is the appeal. It addresses itself to our gratitude and our honesty. What shall we say to it?

To this we have already replied in part,

1. That the intention of the Framers is to be inferred from what they have framed; and that what they framed is not to be interpreted according to *our notions* of their intentions, but according to its plain and obvious sense: and *that* sense, it has been shown, is opposed to the tenets of Calvin.

2. The allegation, that the Framers of the Prayer Book held Calvinistic opinions, and the inference that *therefore* the declarations of the Church in her Baptismal Office that every Infant is regenerate by Baptism, are to be understood only *hypothetically*, was shown to be founded on a misapprehension of Calvinistic opinions. Even, therefore, *if* the *hypothetical* sense were the *true* sense, it would be evident therefrom, that the Framers of those Offices did *not* hold Calvinistic opinions. *If* the Framers were Calvinists, and if the Baptismal Offices are to be taken in a Calvinistic sense, then they must be made to mean, not that *some* Infants *may* be, but that *no* Infants *can* be, regenerate by *Baptism*.

3. Since this imputation of Calvinism to the Prayer Book is one which requires to be fully examined, let us now imagine, for a moment, for argument's sake, that the Framers were Calvinists. But they who *framed* it are not the parties who *authorize its use*. Therefore we are not bound to receive it in the sense of the Framers. Say, if you will, that the Reformers framed it and that they were Calvinists; but *they* do not *impose* it upon us. The Prayer Book is the Prayer Book of the *Church*. The Articles are the Articles of the *Church*. *She* is the imponent; and *her* sense is the sense in which we are to receive it: and she enjoins us to receive them in their "plain and full meaning," and "in their *literal* and *grammatical sense*<sup>3</sup>," and *not* in the sense of parties whose very names are unknown to the majority of her people.

To illustrate this,—What is the Title of the Sovereign of England? Her most Gracious Majesty is "DEFENDER OF THE FAITH." This Title was first given to an English Monarch by a Pontiff of Rome. Pope Leo X. was its Framer. Do you receive it in the sense of the Framer? Do you thence infer that our beloved Queen is bound to "defend the Faith" of the *Council of Trent*? No, Heaven forbid! You pray God that He may give Her His Grace, to defend *the* Faith, the True Faith, the Faith of the Church, the Faith of CHRIST.

4. We now come to consider the allegation *historically*. The Reformers, it is said by some, were Calvinists; and we must receive the Prayer Book according to their sense.

This is a very large assertion. How shall we deal with it?

*What* Reformers do you mean? we would ask in

<sup>3</sup> Declaration Prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, and received by the CHURCH in Convocation at the last review in 1662.

reply. In order to interpret the Book of Common Prayer, a Book to be used and understood by all,—Princes and Peasants, learned and unlearned, adults and children,—must we needs travel through the voluminous writings of the Reformers? We shall have to peruse some hundreds of works in various languages, composed by men of very different characters, and of very different sentiments. We shall be lost in a labyrinth. Is this to be the solution of our doubts, this the end of our debates? Shall we desert the plain sense of the Prayer Book for such a mode of interpretation as that? It would be to exchange light for darkness, and to quit the solid rock for the drifting sand.

But no—the objectors reply—we do not desire this; we would not send you to the writings of Luther, Melancthon, and the German School of Reformers. Nor would we refer you to his Zwinglian opponents and the theological writers of Zurich. But we are speaking of the English Prayer Book, and of its Framers; we affirm that *they* held Calvinistic opinions, and that this Book must be therefore construed in accordance with the tenets of Calvin.

Thus, we see, the question is brought within a smaller compass. The appeal is to Calvinistic Divines, or to those who are alleged to be so.

Let us therefore apply this rule; and see the result.

5. At the head of Calvinistic Divines stands Calvin himself. He was at the highest pitch of his fame in the reign of King Edward VI., when our Book of Common Prayer was framed. Was he concerned in the work? No. Was he consulted with respect to it? No. Was he asked to approve it? No. Did he ever see it? No, apparently not; but he *heard* an account of it. And what did he think of it? After King Edward's death, some of the English refugees settled

at Frankfort, where a question arose, whether the English Service should be celebrated according to the Book of Common Prayer. Some desired it; others were dissatisfied with the Ceremonies prescribed in that Book; and they addressed a letter to Calvin, giving him a description of the English Prayer Book, and asking his advice whether with a good conscience they might conform to it? He replied from Geneva, on the 18th of January, 1555, as follows: "In the English Book of Common Prayer, such as *you describe it to me*" (whence it would appear that he had *never seen it*), "I perceive that there were many sufferable *absurdities* ('*tolerabiles ineptias*'), by which I mean, that it did not possess that purity which was to be wished. However, those evils could not be remedied at once; and since the Book did not contain *any open impiety*, they were to be tolerated for the time. It was *lawful* to *begin* with such rudiments as these, in order that pious ministers might afterwards make further progress, and aim at something better. But now, since you may compose *another* Prayer Book, I cannot understand what those persons mean who are in *love with the dregs of Popery*, and cling to the old <sup>4</sup>."

In consequence of this letter, the Prayer Book was *not* used by the English at Frankfort, except in a mutilated form <sup>5</sup>.

Three years after this letter of Calvin, Queen Elizabeth came to the throne: and at her accession the English Book of Common Prayer, with all its "*sufferable absurdities*" and "*dregs of Popery*" (as Calvin was pleased to call them) was restored. Indeed, something more of that obnoxious character (as *he* deemed it) was then revived; for the Service Book of *Queen Elizabeth*

<sup>4</sup> Calvini Epistolæ, Ep. cc. p. 336, Lausannæ, 1676. See also Neal's History, i. p. 78, ed. Lond. 1837.

<sup>5</sup> Neal's Hist. i. 78.

*brought back* some of the ceremonial usages of King Edward's *first* Service Book, which had been omitted in the *second*.

What is the inference from this?

The Framers of the English Prayer Book could not have been very deeply imbued with the tenets of Calvin, if they took so little pains to consult Calvin himself *before* they framed it, and paid so little attention to his judgment *after* they had done so: and if the judgment which he pronounced on the work was, that it contained "*tolerable absurdities*" and "*dregs of Popery*," but "*no open impiety*."

6. The authority of Calvin having thus failed the objectors, who ascribe Calvinistic opinions to the Framers of the Prayer Book, they next take another position. They say that the phraseology of our Baptismal Office is borrowed from the Cologne Service drawn up by Martin Bucer, a Reformer of Strasburg, in 1543; and that the well-known sentiments of Bucer preclude any doubt as to the sense in which the language there adopted was used. In other words, the argument stands thus. Bucer (they allege) was a Calvinist, he therefore could not believe that all Infants are regenerate in Baptism; he drew up a Liturgy, and from a part of that Liturgy some paragraphs of *our* Baptismal Office are translated; and therefore our Baptismal Office must be understood in a Calvinistic sense.

Such is the argument.

Upon it we observe, first, that the framework of our Liturgy and Administration of the Sacraments is derived mainly from Holy Scripture and the *Primitive Church*. As Bishop Jewell says: "We approach as closely as possible to the Church of the Apostles, and primitive Catholic Bishops, and Fathers . . . and we have not only conformed our Doctrine, but also our Order of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, to

their Ritual and Practice<sup>6</sup>." Accordingly, we find that many of the Prayers of our Baptismal Office are literally translated from Liturgies, which existed many hundreds of years *before Bucer was born*<sup>7</sup>. The Prayer in which we there beseech God that "He would *re-generate* the Child" to be baptized, is one of these. That Prayer was offered up by the early Church, which never heard of Calvinistic Doctrines, and which knew of no other mode of Regeneration but by the Sacrament of Baptism. If then the authorities, from which the Baptismal Office is derived, are to supply the rule for its interpretation, the sense of the *Ancient Church* must

<sup>6</sup> Apolog. Eccl. Angl. vi. A.D. 1562. And see the declarations of Parliament below, pp. 152, 153.

<sup>7</sup> The following Parallels between the English Baptismal and *Ancient Liturgies* deserve to be noted: they will be found in Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, ii. pp. 172—204.

Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.

Exoremus, ut aquis his virtutem transfundat et ad peragendum sacratissimæ *regenerationis effectum* præsentia Trinæ Majestatis assistat.

We call upon Thee for this Infant, that *he* coming to Thy holy baptism may receive *remission of sins by spiritual regeneration*, &c. that he may enjoy the everlasting benediction of Thy heavenly washing.

Te invoco super hunc famulum Tuum N. qui baptismi Tui donum petens æternam consequi gratiam *spirituali regeneratione* desiderat . . . ut æternam cœlestis lavacri benedictionem consecutus, etc.

We yield Thee hearty thanks that it hath *pleased Thee to regenerate* this Infant with Thy Holy Spirit.

Famulos Tuos quos jussisti *renasci* ex aquâ et Spiritu Sancto.

In Confirmation,

Let us pray,

Almighty and everlasting God, Who *hast vouchsafed to regenerate* these Thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and *hast given them forgiveness of all their sins*, &c.

Oremus,

Omnipotens sempiternæ Deus qui *regenerare dignatus* es hos famulos Tuos ex aquâ et Spiritu Sancto quique dedisti *eis remissionem* omnium peccatorum, etc.

give the law to the whole, and the sense of Bucer (whatever it be) must bow to that.

We shall have occasion to enquire hereafter, whether Bucer be rightly described as a Calvinist. But let us now proceed to observe, that he had, it is true, *a part* in drawing up the Liturgy of Cologne; but he was associated in that work with *another* person; and that person was *Melancthon*<sup>8</sup>. Melancthon (as all know) was no Calvinist, but a Lutheran, and a very leading one. He was mainly instrumental in drawing up the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, and the Apology for that Confession. Melancthon, and his Lutheran<sup>9</sup> Brethren therein declare<sup>10</sup> that the Holy Spirit is given by the Sacraments, and that Baptism is necessary to

<sup>8</sup> Melancthon says, Aug. 2, 1543, Ep. 30, "Bucerus et *ego* opus absolvimus." See Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran., p. 436.

<sup>9</sup> See the Confession to be subscribed by the Lutheran Clergy of Saxony, A.D. 1592. Hase, p. 803.

1. "There is one Baptism which cleanses us from sin."

2. "By Baptism, as by the laver of Regeneration, God saves us; and effects in us Justification, and Forgiveness of sins, so that they who continue in that Covenant and in the Faith to the end, do not perish, but have everlasting life."

3. "*All* who are baptized into Christ, are baptized into His death, and are buried with Him in baptism unto death, and have put on Christ. Baptism is the laver of Regeneration, because in it we are born again, and are sealed with the spirit of Adoption by God's free grace."

<sup>10</sup> "Per Verbum et Sacramenta tanquam per Instrumenta donatur Spiritus Sanctus." "Per Baptismum offertur gratia Dei." "Damnant anabaptistas qui affirmant pueros sine Baptismo salvos fieri." "Damnant anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum." "Baptismus puerorum est necessarius et efficax ad salutem." "Salus cum baptismo offertur." See the Augsburg Confession, V. IX. XII. XIII. Apol. iv. 52, pp. 11, 12, 13, 156, ed. Hase, Lips. 1837.

N.B.—BUCER's name stands subscribed to the Augsburg Confession, and to the Apology, *ibid.* p. 357, A.D. 1537; and Bucer was mainly employed in the Formula Concordiæ with the Lutherans at Wittenberg, see *ibid.* p. 358, and Seckendorf, Hist. Luth. iii. § xlvii.

Salvation, and that Infants are born again by Baptism, and they were very strongly opposed to the Calvinistic Tenets of indefectible Grace, and of absolute Predestination, and they teach that the cause of sin is the Will of Man which turns itself from God<sup>1</sup>. In all these respects Melancthon maintained a sound scriptural Faith. *If* then the sense of the framers of the Liturgy of Cologne is to be allowed to regulate the interpretation of the Liturgy of England, we do not see any reason, why the *known orthodoxy* of Melancthon should be set aside in order to make way for the *alleged heterodoxy* of Bucer, especially as the known orthodoxy of the former is in perfect unison with the literal sense of our Liturgy, which is opposed to the alleged heterodoxy of the other.

7. This plea from the Cologne Liturgy being thus disposed of, let us now enquire what other allegation is adduced, in order to persuade us that we must receive our Baptismal Office in a Calvinistic sense.

We were first referred to the Reformers generally, and it was said that we must accept the Liturgy in the sense of the Reformers who framed the Prayer Book. When we proceeded to enquire, *What* Reformers were meant, we were informed that *not* the Lutheran Reformers, *nor* the Zwinglian Reformers, *but* the Calvinistic Reformers were the parties in question: and it was affirmed that we are to be guided by their opinions in interpreting our Prayer Book. When we proceeded to examine, whether among these Calvinists we might reckon Calvin, we found that we could not: What then is to be done? *Who are* these Calvinistic Reformers? Let them appear.

<sup>1</sup> See Melancthon's *Loci Theologici de Prædest.* ii. p. 52. He expunged a statement of Calvin "de Electione" from Calvin's *Consensio Tigurina*. See Calvin's *Epist. ad Melancth.* 4 Kal. Dec. 1552. On the amissibility of grace, see *Loci Theol.* i. 100. 251.



To this it is said;—Our English Reformers in the reign of King Edward VI., and especially toward the middle and end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, held Calvinistic opinions. During her reign the “Christian Institution” of Calvin was commonly used as a Text Book of Theology in our Universities, and was in high esteem with our Clergy. They understood our Liturgical offices in a Calvinistic sense, and they designed that they should be so understood.

Such is the plea. But a little historical research will show that it is unsound. Our Prayer Book was published in 1549, in Edward VIth’s reign, then again in the same reign, in 1552: then again at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, in 1559. This last edition was only a reproduction of King Edward VIth’s Second Prayer Book, with some slight modifications, none of which were of a Calvinistic tendency, but the reverse; and *no other* review of the Prayer Book took place in *her reign*. It matters therefore little to our present argument, what were the opinions<sup>2</sup> of the English Divines in the reign of *Elizabeth*; they were not the Framers of the Prayer Book<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The following Canon subscribed by *all* the Bishops in 1571, records their opinions. “*Inprimis*,—Preachers shall take heed that they teach nothing in their Sermons to be believed faithfully by the People, save what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and to what the *Catholic Fathers* and *Ancient Bishops* have deduced therefrom.” See Cardwell’s Synodalia, i. pp. 111. 126. This Canon is contemporary with the last Elizabethan Edition of the Articles.

<sup>3</sup> How far the later Elizabethan Divines are chargeable with Calvinism has been examined by Dr. Waterland, Supplement to Case of Arian Subscription, vol. ii. pp. 375—384, ed. Bp. Van Mildert, 1823. See above, Sermon V. p. 122. Much stress has been laid on the authorization of the Decades of Bullinger (who however differed from Calvin, see Letters relative to the Reformation, Parker Society, p. 327). But why should not an equal stress be laid on the authorization of *Erasmus’ Paraphrase*? which in King Edward’s

But a fact may be mentioned here, as showing that the Prayer Book was not regarded as Calvinistic at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign. For ten years after her Accession, Roman Catholics attended our Service<sup>4</sup>, which doubtless they would regard as defective, but which they could not deny to be truly Catholic: and it cannot be imagined that a Service should be understood in a Calvinistic sense, in which all were expected and required by Law<sup>5</sup> to join, and in which they did actually join without scruple.

Here then the question is brought within a still narrower range. We need not enquire into the opinions of the Reformers in Queen Elizabeth's reign; but the circumstances of the case require that we should confine ourselves to the Reformers in the reign of King Edward. And since it is affirmed that we must interpret the Prayer Book by the opinions of its Framers, we would again ask, Who are these Calvinistic Reformers by whom we are to be guided? And we pause for a reply.

8. Here two names are adduced. *Not* two *English* names; but the names of two foreigners; one of these is a Florentine, Peter Martyr. The other a Theologian from Strasburg, Martin Bucer. These two learned persons were invited to England by Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the reign of King Edward VI., and their advice was asked by him in framing and

and Queen Elizabeth's reigns, "every Parish was driven to buy." (See Dr. Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* ii. p. 126.) The fact is, Books for the Clergy were scarce, and the Convocation was obliged to use what it found at hand. Some striking Anti-Calvinistic passages are cited from the Paraphrase by Archbishop Laurence, *Doctrine of Baptism*, p. 81.

<sup>4</sup> Camden *Annal.* 1570. Bishop Andrewes' *Tortura Torti*, pp. 130-2, Clarendon. Archbishop Bramhall, i. p. 248. Heylin's *Hist. Ref.* ii. p. 111.

<sup>5</sup> Act of Uniformity, Eliz. c. 2, § xiv.

reviewing the English Liturgy. They therefore (it is alleged) are the persons by whose opinions we must be guided in its interpretation.

On this allegation it may be observed, that it is not a new one. It was urged long ago against the English Church, by Cardinal Bellarmine, the Champion of Rome, that we had derived our Faith from Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer<sup>6</sup>.

But to this, it was replied by Bishop Andrewes<sup>7</sup>, that Peter Martyr and Bucer had entered into other men's labours. The Book of Common Prayer was printed and published on May 4, 1549. Peter Martyr came to England in the winter of 1547<sup>8</sup>, but Bucer was not in this country till the spring of 1549<sup>9</sup>. One of these two learned foreigners might perhaps have been consulted in the compilation of the Prayer Book, but it may be easily shown that his opinions did not prevail in it<sup>1</sup>. The advice of the other was not had; so that hitherto they certainly cannot be regarded as the Framers of the Book of Common Prayer.

But, as has been observed, the Prayer Book was reviewed about three years after its first publication, and then it is true that Bucer was resorted to, and his observations<sup>2</sup> upon it were communicated to the Council

<sup>6</sup> "Fides, quæ nunc in Angliâ viget, seminatores habuit Mart. Bucerum et Petrum Martyrem, utrumque Apostatam." Bellarm. Apol. p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Ad Card. Bellarm. Apol. Respons. p. 31.

<sup>8</sup> Sleidan Vit. Martyr. p. 13.

<sup>9</sup> Strype, Cranmer, i. p. 281.

<sup>1</sup> This will appear more fully below. "It cannot, I think, be proved, that *any foreign* influence was exerted in this instance (*i. e.* the composition of K. Edward's First Service Book); and the presumption arising from the comparison of the Liturgy with the general sentiments of the foreign Reformers is strongly in the opposite direction." Dr. Cardwell, Preface to Two Liturgies, p. xii.

<sup>2</sup> Which will be found in his Scripta Anglicana, pp. 456—503, where they are humbly submitted to the Archbishop's consideration.

of English Bishops and Divines who executed the work, and in some cases his recommendations were adopted, while in others they were rejected<sup>3</sup>. He was not, therefore, a Framers of the Prayer Book; but his opinions were tendered to other parties, who considered them, and who adopted or declined the suggestions which were submitted by him, as they thought fit. With respect to Peter Martyr, it is very doubtful whether his recommendations were considered at all.

Upon the whole, we affirm, it might as well be contended, that the professional advisers, whose opinion is taken with a view to the drawing of a Bill to be carried into Law by Parliament, are the *Legislators* by whom it is enacted, as that Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, who were consulted, before the framing of the Prayer Book, were the parties by whom it was *framed*.

We might here bid farewell to these two learned foreigners, if it were not necessary, once for all, fully to expose the fallacy of this rule of interpretation which it has now been proposed to apply to our Prayer Book. "Bucer and Martyr," it is said, "framed it; therefore," it is added, "we must be guided by their opinions in understanding it." But the fact is, they did *not* frame it. And now let us consider what would be the consequence of admitting that they *did* frame it, and that we must be guided by their sense in interpreting it.

We should admit what is not true, and which would involve us in inexplicable perplexity.

They are dated Cambridge, Jan. 5, 1551. Bucer died on the 1st of March following. See Dr. Lamb's Original Documents, p. 155.

<sup>3</sup> See this fully proved by Dr. Cardwell, Preface to Two Liturgies of K. Edward VI., pp. xxv. xxvi. The matters observed on "in the Prayer Book, were *not* corrected in most instances in the way that Martyr and Bucer recommended." See also Neal's History, i. p. 56.

It is not easy to say precisely what the opinions of Bucer were. His name appears among those who subscribed the Augsburg Confession and to its Apology<sup>4</sup>; and thus he publicly associated and identified himself with the *Lutherans*, whose opinions, declared therein, have been already stated; and yet we are assured that our Prayer Book, alleged to have been framed by him, is to be understood in a Calvinistic sense.

But this is not the whole of the difficulty.

Peter Martyr, it is said, was another of the Framers, and we must also understand it in *his* sense. We must understand it *both* in Bucer's sense and in Martyr's sense. But, unfortunately, Martyr and Bucer would not understand it in one another's sense. On this very question of Baptism they differed widely. Peter Martyr<sup>5</sup> taught that Baptism does *not confer* grace:

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 137, note 10. He agreed with Luther and Melancthon concerning the corporal presence in the Eucharist in 1536. See the Concordia in Scripta Anglicana, p. 654, and Sekendorff, H. L. iii. § xlvii.

<sup>5</sup> P. Martyr (p. 1099, Epist. Eccl. Angl.) censures the Lutheran doctrine on Baptism, and (in the passage cited above, Sermon IV. p. 90) he blames St. Augustine for teaching that we are regenerate by baptism. In his letter to Bullinger, 14th June, 1552, i. e. *after* the framing of King Edward's Second Service Book, he is desirous "that the pure and simple use of the Sacraments *should* at length be *restored*," he owns that he "altogether dissents from Augustine," he states his opinion (afterwards severely reproved by Hooker, v. lvii. 1) that the main use of Sacraments is to *teach* the mind, and to be a seal of grace previously promised and received. In this letter, (as the Editor of the letter observes, p. 12,) "the notion that grace is conferred by virtue of the Sacraments is distinctly repudiated" by him, indeed it is declared to be *superstitious*. What would *Bucer* have said to this? and what would P. Martyr have said to our CHURCH CATECHISM, which teaches that Sacraments are "means whereby we receive an inward and spiritual grace?"

Bucer most confidently asserts that it *does*<sup>6</sup>. Which of the two shall we believe?

Again, on the other Sacrament they were not agreed. Bucer inclined to the Lutherans<sup>7</sup>, Peter Martyr to the Zwinglians<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> His language concerning Baptism is wholly at variance with that of Calvin. See his *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 596. “Effectus baptismatis est remissio peccatorum;” “Baptismo tribuitur a Domino Ipso effectus, *Regeneratio* ;” “remissio vel ablutio peccatorum;” “mors et Sepultura peccati, vitæ novitas,” p. 597; “Salus nobis, ipsaque nostri *regeneratio* et renovatio nobis per Baptisma. Ad hæc præstanda uti Dominus dignatur instrumento Baptismate,” p. 543; “Dominus confert Baptismate regenerationem, p. 655; Sacrum Baptisma et nobis habetur et de eo docetur ut de vero lavacro regenerationis.” This is in his *Concordia* with Luther.

It has been alleged that Bucer intended these words to be applied to God's *Elect* alone. But this is not to the purpose. Calvin never imagined the *elect* to be *regenerate by Baptism*, which Bucer asserts us to be. And Bucer distinctly affirms, p. 598, that “Salus baptismate *offertur omnibus* ;” and again, p. 178, “Hæreditatem Dei certo accipiunt *omnes* ei qui gratiam hanc in baptismo sibi communicatam non ipsimet per peccata abjiciunt” (so that grace in *his* view is not indefectible). How this can be reconciled with the assertion that in his opinion offers of salvation are made only to the elect, it is not easy to see.

<sup>7</sup> See Bossuet, *Variations*, viii. § 7, § 9, concerning Bucer's Lutheranism; and see Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 551. Bucer did not approve P. Martyr's assertion, that “the body and blood of Christ is not *carnaliter aut corporaliter* in pane et vino,” but wished it to be altered to “*localiter* in pane et vino,” 20th June, 1549. cf. Burnet *Reform.* ii. pp. 216, 217, ed. 1829, and Strype's *Memoirs*, ii. 326.

<sup>8</sup> Zwingle thus declares his opinion concerning the Sacraments:—“I believe, indeed know, that, so far are the Sacraments from *conferring grace*, that they do not *even offer it*. . . . Sacraments are given as a public testimony of that grace which has before been given privately.” *Confess. ad Carol. Imp.* vol. ii. p. 541. Zwingle taught “that the bread and wine were no more than *signs* appointed to denote the benefits conferred on mankind by the death of Christ.” See the authorities in Mosheim, cent. xi. cap. ii. § 11,

Suppose, then, a controversy to arise in the Church of England with respect to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and with regard to the meaning of the words of the Catechism in the Prayer Book which say that "the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Suppose the question to be, What is the meaning of the Church in using this language? we need a rule of interpretation. "The sense of its Framers, Peter Martyr and Bucer; this," it is replied, "must be your rule."

Now, first of all, this sentence *did not exist* in the Prayer Book till about *fifty years after* Martyr and Bucer were *dead*. It was added in 1604; therefore they were not its Framers, nor were they consulted by them. Here is one difficulty. Next, since Peter Martyr and Bucer were of *different opinions* in this matter<sup>9</sup>, we cannot

who adds that "Bucer endeavoured to modify this doctrine so as to give it a certain degree of conformity to the hypothesis of Luther."

<sup>9</sup> See letters relative to the Reformation, published by Parker Society, 1846-7, in which there are bitter complaints from Calvinists of Bucer: e. g. p. 652,—“Bucer and Paul Fagius have arrived in England, and have written to this place from the palace of the Archbishop of Canterbury. I wish they may not pervert him or make him worse.” Burcher, May 30, 1549, p. 662. Again: “In case of Bucer's death, England will be happy in having been delivered in the same year from two men of most pernicious talent, Paul Fagius and Bucer.” Idem to Bullinger, April 20, 1550. See also, p. 666, the letter dated June 8, 1550. See also, p. 696. For Calvin's complaints of Bucer's ambiguity, see the passages collected by Bossuet, Variations, iv. § 25. See also letters, Parker Society, p. 583, Utenhovius to Bullinger, July 7, 1549: “Send me whatever you have of Bucer's on the Lord's Supper, written before he began to dote,” and cf. p. 544, where Bucer says to Brentius, May 15, 1550: “I am sorry for Master Martyr's book (on the Eucharist), as any can be.” P. 572, Micronius to Bullinger, Oct. 13, 1550, says: “Master à Lasco strenuously confutes Bucer's opinion. I pray that God may see fit to open his mind.” The Editor observes, p. 544: “Bucer recommended the use of more dark and

follow *both*; if we follow Martyr we should be in danger of becoming Zwinglians, if we follow Bucer we should approach very near Consubstantiation; in either case we should be in peril of losing the Scriptural Doctrine of the Sacrament taught by the Church of England.

9. You see, then, that this novel rule is a broken reed; and you will hardly need any further caution against it. Let us, therefore, now proceed to answer the enquiry which is sometimes made of us: "Do you therefore (we are asked) reject *all extrinsic* aid in interpreting the Prayer Book? Do you pay no respect to the opinions of its Framers, and of those also who authorized its use?" Yes, certainly, we would reply; we pay them great homage and veneration; and we do so, as we believe, in the most grateful spirit and honourable terms. We believe and profess, that in framing and authorizing the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER to be used by the English Nation in the Public Worship of God, they framed and authorized a Book, which the English Nation can understand. We believe and profess, that in framing and authorizing a Book of Common Prayer to be used, and used intelligently, by every Peasant and Child, they have framed and authorized a Book, which Peasants and Children can understand. We cannot be guilty of such ingratitude, injury, and insult to those pious and holy men, as to imagine that they intended that the poor, the illiterate, and the young, should be deluded by ambiguous terms in the concerns of their immortal souls. We are persuaded that the Framers of the English Prayer Book endeavoured earnestly to speak openly; and we are sure that the natural sense

ambiguous form of speech," by his conciliatory character he laid himself "open to the odium of his opponents and the distrust of his friends." Ibid. p. 696. See also Walchii Bibl. Theol. ii. p. 450,—  
"Bucerus in doctrinâ de hoc Sacramento varius, inconstans."



of their words is the only sense in which they intended their words to be understood.

While we believe and profess this, we also readily allow that light may be shed on the pages of the Prayer Book from a knowledge of the opinions of those who framed it and of those who authorized it. We fully recognize the benefit of all such enquiries as these. We desire no secrecy. But let not the world be deceived by erroneous statements; let the *truth* be known. Let all, whose circumstances allow, make themselves cognizant of the names and opinions of those venerable persons, to whom they are indebted under God for the unspeakable blessing of the Book of Common Prayer. They will find that they, who framed and authorized it, said what they meant, and meant what they said. They were honest men.

10. Who then were its Framers? Not foreigners from Italy and France; but Martyrs and Bishops of England<sup>1</sup>. At their head stands the revered name of Archbishop Cranmer, who died in the cause of pure Religion. Next is that of Ridley, afterwards Bishop of London, who *gave his body to be burned* for the truth in Christ.

What were their opinions? The tenets of the Framers have been appealed to; and it is alleged that by them we must interpret the Prayer Book. Here then, we say, are the two principal Framers,—not from Florence and Strasburg, but from London; and not private individuals, but an Archbishop and Bishop of England. Did they hold Calvinistic opinions?

Happily we have abundant materials for a reply to this question. We possess a series of works from the

<sup>1</sup> See the names of the thirteen Bishops and Divines, who were appointed to frame the Liturgy, in Nicholls' Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, p. v. Ridley was then Bishop of Rochester.

pen of ARCHBISHOP CRANMER, or authorized by him, dating from the year 1537 down to the very time of, and indeed till after, the publication of the Second Prayer Book of King Edward the Sixth. You will not find the tenets of Calvin, or any thing like them, in those works. In the first of them, published in 1537<sup>2</sup>, he says, “Children must needs be baptized, and *by the Sacrament of Baptism* they obtain *remission of their sins, the grace and favour* of God, and be made *thereby* the Children of God. And Infants must need be Christened, because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted; which *cannot be done but by the Sacrament of Baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost.*” In the year 1540 he says, “In *Baptism* we be *regenerated* and pardoned of our sin by the Blood of Christ<sup>3</sup>.” In 1543 he says, that “Infants, because they be born in original sin, have need to be Christened, *whereby* they, being offered in the Faith of the Church, *receive forgiveness of their sin*, and such grace of the Holy Ghost, that if they die in the state of their Infancy they shall thereby undoubtedly be saved<sup>4</sup>.” “The justification of Infants is wrought by the secret operation of the Holy Ghost in their Baptism, they being offered in the faith of the Church<sup>5</sup>.” In the same work he maintains the true doctrine of Universal Redemption in opposition to Calvin; and condemns his errors concerning Predestination<sup>6</sup>. In 1548 he says, that

<sup>2</sup> The Institution of a Christian Man, p. 93. Ed. Lloyd. Oxford, 1825.

<sup>3</sup> Questions and Answers on the Sacraments. Cranmer's Works, in Dr. Jenkyns' excellent edition, Oxford, 1833, ii. p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Necessary Doctrine, pp. 254. 366. Ed. Lloyd. Concerning Cranmer's share in this book, and his adoption and maintenance of it, see Dr. Jenkyns' Preface, p. xxxix.

<sup>5</sup> Page 366.

<sup>6</sup> See the three last chapters on Free-will, &c., pp. 359—374.

“God is naturally good, and willeth all men to be saved: and truly

“our Lord did institute Baptism, *whereby* we be born again to the Kingdom of God, and *by it* we be born again to a *new and heavenly life*, and be received into God’s Church, which is the foundation and pillar of the Truth. And St. Paul calleth it the *bath of regeneration*, because our sins be forgiven *us in it*, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us as into God’s beloved children; and so we shall be saved for ever, if we continue to our life’s end in the Faith of Christ<sup>7</sup>.”

In the year 1550, he says, that “as surely as we see, feel, and touch water with our bodies, and be washed with water, so *assuredly ought we to believe*, when we be baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, and that by Him we be *newly born spiritually*, and washed from our sins, and grafted in the stock of Christ’s own Body, and be apparelled, clothed, and harnessed with Him in such wise, that as the Devil hath no power against CHRIST, so hath he none against *us*, so long as we remain grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel, and harnessed with that armour<sup>8</sup>.”

In the year 1551, he asks, “How can *he* be taken for a good Christian man, who thinketh that Christ did ordain His Sacramental Signs in vain, *without effectual grace and operation*<sup>9</sup>?”

And again<sup>1</sup>, “In the one Sacrament Christ doth

men be the authors of their own damnation; and they by free-will have abused the Grace of God.” The passages have been given in full by Dr. Winchester on the XVIIth Article, pp. 35. 37, where he says, “These were Cranmer’s doctrines, 1543. How opposite to the rigid ones of Calvin, I need not observe. That he continued in them to the last, will appear from the following quotations.”

<sup>7</sup> Catechism set forth by Archbishop Cranmer in 1548, translated from the German into Latin by Justus Jonas, in 1539. Ed. Burton, Oxf. 1829, pp. 182, 183, see also pp. 185. 187. 189.

<sup>8</sup> Defence of the true Doctrine of the Sacrament, vol. ii. p. 303.

<sup>9</sup> Answer to Gardiner, vol. iii. p. 49.

<sup>1</sup> Page 86.

promise to be our spiritual *regeneration* and apparel, and in the other to be our spiritual meat and drink."

And again<sup>2</sup>, "In Baptism we must think, that as the Priest putteth his hand to the child outwardly, and washeth him with water, so must we think that God putteth to His Hand inwardly, and *washeth the Infant with His Holy Spirit*, and, moreover, that Christ Himself cometh down upon the Child, and apparelleth him with His Own Self."

Such was Cranmer's language *after* the Book of Common Prayer had been published. No one will venture to affirm that these words are consistent with Calvinistic Tenets, and that they are not directly opposed to the teaching of Calvin. Nor is this all. After the Second Prayer Book of King Edward was published, Cranmer was mainly instrumental in reforming Ecclesiastical Laws; and in the Work<sup>3</sup> produced with a view to that result, the errors of Calvin with respect to Predestination are strongly reprobated: for, whereas Calvin teaches that no man can be said to be a believer, unless he is sure that he is elected by God, Cranmer admonishes all men not to rely on the Sentence of God's Predestination, but in all their ways and works to obey God's Law<sup>4</sup>.

Such was the language of Archbishop Cranmer.

<sup>2</sup> Page 553.

<sup>3</sup> The *Reformatio Legum*. See Cranmer's Life by Jenkyns, i. pp. cix. cxi. "It may be safely referred to as an authentic record of Cranmer's opinions."

<sup>4</sup> *Reformatio Legum*. Cap. de Hæresibus, c. 22, de Prædestinatione, p. 21, ed. 1640. This clause is directed against the Predestinarian Gospellers, see Winchester on XVIIth Article, cap. iii. p. 53. It will be remembered that this book was published by John Fox the Martyrologist, under the encouragement of Archbishop Parker in 1571. See Strype's Parker, p. 323, and Map. Letter of Parker to Cecil, 4 June, 1571. Dr. Bennet's Essay on the Articles, p. 338.

BISHOP RIDLEY thus speaks :—" A man in his regeneration is received into the holy Catholic Church of Christ, and is now to be accounted for one of the lively members of Christ's body<sup>5</sup>." " The water in Baptism is Sacramentally changed into the fountain of Regeneration<sup>6</sup>." " Baptism is ordained in water for Spiritual Regeneration<sup>7</sup>." The water in Baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given; not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water<sup>8</sup>. True it is that grace is conferred by the Sacrament, but as by an instrument. The inward power and Christ confer grace by the Sacrament<sup>9</sup>."

You have now heard the testimony of these two Prelates, ARCHBISHOP CRANMER and BISHOP RIDLEY, who, as might have been expected from their high station, had the principal share and authority in framing and promulgating the Prayer Book and the Articles, at the Reformation. Both of these English Prelates were distinguished by piety and learning. They had devoted many years to the study of Theology, and were skilled in the controversies of their age; and had gained experience and wisdom from them. And they sealed their testimony with their blood. Far, very far indeed were they both from holding the opinions of Calvin. I do not mean to deny that they were on terms of intimacy with many learned men, who paid deference to the learning of Calvin; nor would I affirm that they did not pay great regard to the erudition, and (in some respects) to the piety and zeal of Calvin himself. But as far as they could be said to ally themselves in opinion with Foreign Reformers in regard to those

<sup>5</sup> Bishop Ridley's Piteous Lamentation, Works, p. 57, ed. Parker Society, 841.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. page 12.

<sup>7</sup> Disput. at Oxford, *ibid.* page 470.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. page 246.

<sup>9</sup> Page 471.

*special controverted points*, which are at present under discussion, they agreed with Melancthon and the sounder Lutheran<sup>1</sup> Divines; who, as is well known, were opposed to Calvin, with respect to the Sacrament of Baptism, and in the proximate questions of Predestination and Election, and Final Perseverance. But Cranmer and Ridley did not derive their doctrine from *men*, but from the WORD of GOD. And next to that Word they revered the teaching and practice of the Primitive Church. And (God be thanked!) they framed the Prayer Book accordingly.

The Lords and Commons of England in Parliament assembled, on receiving the Book of Common Prayer from their hands, uttered these memorable words: "To the intent that a uniform, quiet, and godly Order" of Common Prayer "should be had, His Highness the King hath ordered *the Archbishop of Canterbury*, and certain of the most learned and discreet *Bishops*, to consider and ponder the premisses; and that thereupon, having as well eye and respect to the *most sincere and pure Religion taught in Scripture*, as to the *usages of the Primitive Church*, they should draw and make one

<sup>1</sup> See Melancthon's *Loci Theologici de Prædestinatione*, vol. ii. p. 50, ed. Erlang. 1828, and Bishop Bull, *Apol. pro Harmon*, Sect. vii. § 29; iv. p. 454. "*Melancthonis dogmata ut Scripturis et Veteris Ecclesiæ decretis maximè consentanea primos nostræ Reformationis auctores, rejectis Calvini placitis, amplexos fuisse dixi.*" See also the authorities in Dr. Winchester on the XVIIth Article, Lond. 1803. After entering fully into the question, pp. 37. 31, Dr. Cardwell, Preface to *Two Liturgies*, p. xxxii., thus speaks, "Calvin's peculiar opinions were *not* approved by the leading Reformers of England, who adopted generally the *opposite* sentiments of Luther and Melancthon."

See the same assertion made very fully by Bishop Bull, *Apol. pro Harmon*. Sect. 1, § 4, who specifies the "*antiqua dogmata a Calvini placitis abhorrentia apud nos fixa et stabilita. Norunt omnes, qui in historiâ nostrâ planè non hospites sunt, Reformationem nostram ad exemplar veteris Ecclesiæ Catholicæ conformatam fuisse,*" vol. iv. p. 308, ed. Burton.

convenient and meet Order, Rite, and Fashion of COMMON and OPEN PRAYER and ADMINISTRATION of the SACRAMENTS; the which *at this time, by the aid of the HOLY GHOST, is with one uniform agreement of them concluded*<sup>2</sup>."

In the following year they thus speak: "A Book hath been set forth, entitled 'The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments' agreeable to the *use of the Primitive Church*, in which nothing is ordained to be read *but the very pure word of God, or which is evidently grounded upon the same*<sup>3</sup>."

And again, with regard to the Second Service Book<sup>4</sup>: "A very godly Order hath been perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and set forth, and agreeable to the *Word of God and the Primitive Church*, very comfortable to all good people, and most profitable to the estate of this Realm, upon the which the mercy, favour, and blessing of ALMIGHTY GOD is in no wise so readily and plenteously poured as by Common Prayers, due using of the Sacraments, and, often preaching of the Gospel, with the devotion of the hearers<sup>5</sup>."

Such was the language of the English Parliament concerning the Liturgy.

11. The Book of Common Prayer being suppressed in the reign of Queen Mary, was restored (with two or three modifications) at the accession of Queen Elizabeth<sup>6</sup>; and no alteration was made in it during her reign.

<sup>2</sup> 2 and 3 Edward VI. c. 1. Bishop Gibson's Codex, p. 260.

<sup>3</sup> 3 and 4 Edward VI. *ibid.* p. 264.

<sup>4</sup> The occasion of the review in 1551 is thus stated, "Whereas divers doubts for the fashion and ministration of the Service have arisen *rather by the curiosity of the Minister, and Mistakers, than of any other worthy cause, &c.*" It is clear that the *doctrine of both Service Books* is regarded as substantially the same.

<sup>5</sup> 5 and 6 Edward VI. *ibid.* p. 265.

<sup>6</sup> The Act 1 Eliz. cap. 2 (April 28, 1559), Gibson's Codex, p. 268, restores the Second Service Book of King Edward "with one

Hitherto, then, we see clearly that the Prayer Book was not framed by persons holding Calvinistic opinions. In the words of Bishop Bull, "The opinions of the first authors of our English Reformation were altogether averse from the doctrine and discipline of Calvin<sup>7</sup>."

Calvinistic tenets were, doubtless, propagated in England with great activity during the reign of Elizabeth. And at the accession of her successor, King James I., an effort was made by those who held them to introduce them into the Articles of the Church. For example, it was proposed to decree in the sixteenth Article that grace, having been once received, *could never be lost*; and that the Nine Assertions, commonly called the Lambeth Articles, which have a strong Calvinistic bias, should be added to the XVIIth Article, on Predestination<sup>8</sup>." But both these propositions were rejected, and the Book of Common Prayer was preserved intact; and certain additions were made to it, very clearly asserting that the "Sacraments are means whereby 'inward spiritual grace' is given unto us," all

alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be read on every Sunday in the year, and the form of Litany altered and corrected ("by the omission of the Clause from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities"), and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacraments to the communicants, and none other or otherwise."

The rubric, with respect to the accustomed *Place* of the Church, &c., for Common Prayer was added: also the use of certain vestments, as were in use in the *Second* year of King Edward, but forbidden in the Second Service Book, was restored; and the Protestation at the close of the Communion Office respecting the corporal presence was omitted. Cf. Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 34.

<sup>7</sup> "A Calvini tum disciplinâ tum doctrinâ prorsus alienos fuisse primos Reformationis nostræ auctores satis constat." Bishop Bull, *Apol. pro Harmon.* vii. § 31. Tom. iv. p. 460, ed. Burton, 1827.

<sup>8</sup> Second day's Conference at Hampton Court, January 15, 1603, published by Dean Barlow, 1604, p. 24, Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 178.



conceived and expressed in a very different spirit and language from that of Calvin<sup>9</sup>. In the year 1628, the Royal Declaration, framed "with the advice of as many Bishops as might be conveniently called together," was prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles. And in this it is commanded that those Articles shall be taken in their "plain and full meaning," and "literal and grammatical sense;" and this declaration was received as part of the Book of Common Prayer at the last review<sup>1</sup>.

12. The Book of Common Prayer, having been superseded, but "not legally abolished," in the times of the Great Rebellion, came again under review at the Restoration of King Charles II. The King granted his Commission<sup>2</sup> to several Bishops and other Divines to review the Book of Common Prayer, and to prepare such alterations and additions as they thought fit to offer<sup>3</sup>.

A Conference took place, at which certain Exceptions<sup>4</sup> were tendered against the Book of Common

<sup>9</sup> E. g., the Questions and Answers in the Church Catechism concerning the Catechism, which were composed by Bishop OVERALL, Whittaker's successor, as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and a strong *Anti-Calvinist*. See his Five Chapters "on Predestination, &c.," in Ellis's Defence of XXXIX Articles, pp. 129—139.

<sup>1</sup> See the Papers at the close of Dr. Winchester's Treatise on the XVIIth Article, ed. Churton, 1803.

<sup>2</sup> Dated March 25, 1661, and directed to twelve Bishops, and twelve Presbyterian Divines, with nine assistants on each side, in virtue of which the Commissioners met frequently at the Savoy. (Gibson's Codex, p. 275, Note.) See the Royal Warrant to the Commissioners, in Cardwell's Conf. p. 298. All these Bishops afterwards subscribed their hands to the Book of Common Prayer as reviewed and *established*.

<sup>3</sup> Act of Uniformity, 13th and 14th Car. II. c. 4. Gibson's Codex, p. 275.

<sup>4</sup> The Exceptions, *as actually delivered*, are printed in Sylvester's Life of Baxter: Lond. 1696, pp. 316—333. Also with the replies of the Bishops, in the "History of Nonconformity," by a Presby-

Prayer by Non-conformist Divines. Some of these Exceptions are very pertinent to the question before us. The Non-conformist Divines objected, that "*we cannot in Faith say that every Child that is baptized is Regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; at least, it is a disputable point, and therefore we desire it may be otherwise expressed* <sup>5</sup>."

Here, you will perceive, the very question arose which is now agitated among us.

What, then, was the reply of the Bishops? Did they consider the point disputable? Did they regard it as an *open question*? Did they consent to make any change?

By no means. They retained the expression as it was; and they give their reason, as follows<sup>6</sup>: "God's Sacraments have their effects where the receiver doth not, '*ponere*' *obicem*,' put any bar against them. We may say in faith of *every* Child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit; and the *denial* of it tends to *Anabaptism and the contempt of this Holy Sacrament* <sup>8</sup>."

In the same Office the Non-conformists excepted against the Prayer that the Infant might "receive remission of sins by spiritual *Regeneration*;" and desired that it might be changed<sup>9</sup>.

Did the Bishops comply? No. They retained the expression, and answered that it was "most proper, for Baptism *is* our spiritual Regeneration<sup>1</sup>."

terian Author: ed. Lond. 1708, pp. 152—183. 328—332; and in Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 303—363.

<sup>5</sup> Baxter's Life, p. 327. Cardwell's Conferences, p. 325.

<sup>6</sup> Page 356.

<sup>7</sup> This expression has been lately attributed to "the Scholastic Divines of the fifteenth century." . . . It was used a thousand years before by St. Augustine. See above, Sermon IV. p. 91, and note 6.

<sup>8</sup> Baxter's Life, p. 327. Cardwell, p. 356.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. p. 325.

<sup>1</sup> Cardwell, p. 356.

Again. In the Office for Confirmation, the Non-conformists excepted against the Prayer, in which it is said that God has “vouchsafed to regenerate these His servants by Water and the Holy Ghost; and has given unto them the forgiveness of all their sins.” This, they say, “supposeth that all these children have the Spirit of Christ, and the forgiveness of all their sins<sup>2</sup>.”

To which the Bishops reply. “It supposeth, and that truly, that all children were at their Baptism regenerate by Water and the Holy Ghost, and had given unto them the forgiveness of all their sins<sup>3</sup>.”

The Office for Baptism of *Adults*,—or “of such as are of Riper years,” was added in 1661<sup>4</sup>; and this is a proper occasion for noticing a plea in favour of the *hypothetical* interpretation which has been founded on *that* Office. That plea is as follows:

Every baptized adult is said in that Office to be regenerate. But (by the XXVth Article) Sacraments have a wholesome effect only on those who receive them worthily. Therefore an adult, who has not faith and repentance, (and some doubtless there are who have not these requisites,) cannot be regenerate by Baptism. Therefore the words are to be taken in a *hypothetical* sense: and if so, they may be taken in that sense in the Office for *Infant* Baptism.

Such is the allegation. To it we answer.

(1) The two cases are *not* identical. In the Office of Baptism for *Infants*, the Church says, “Doubt ye not but earnestly believe that God will favourably receive

<sup>2</sup> Baxter's Life, p. 329. Cardwell, p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> Page 358.

<sup>4</sup> “Which office (says the Preface of the Prayer Book) by the growth of Anabaptism . . . is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of natives in our Plantations, and others converted to the Faith.”

this present Infant, that He will embrace *him* with the arms of His mercy."

But in the Office for *Adults*, she first<sup>5</sup> *examines* them, whether they be sufficiently instructed in the articles of Religion, and she annexes a *condition*, thus: "Doubt ye not but earnestly believe that God will favourably receive these present persons, *truly repenting*, and coming unto Him by *Faith*."

She then requires a solemn profession of Repentance and Faith from the parties themselves.

Her subsequent Declaration, "Seeing now, dearly beloved, that these Persons are regenerate," is not to be detached from these previous conditions and stipulations, publicly prescribed and made, but it is to be construed with them.

(2.) Lest haply we should appear to give any countenance to the error of those, who imagine that, in the case of Adults, coming to Baptism *without* the due requisites of Faith and Repentance, *nothing* is offered by God in the Sacrament of Christ, we reply, in the words of St. Augustine, "It is one thing to *have*, and another thing to have *profitably*. The Sacrament of Christ is holy, even in evil men, not only though they *become* evil after baptism, but even if they are baptized being evil." Holy things may exist in unholy men, as the gift of prophecy in Balaam, Saul, and Caiaphas, and of working miracles in Judas. "But holy things exist in evil men, not for their salvation, but for their condemnation<sup>6</sup>;" and he exemplifies this by the case of Simon Magus, "Evil men may have good gifts. Great is the gift of God in Baptism: This gift was given therein to Simon

<sup>5</sup> See Rubric before the Office.

<sup>6</sup> Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. lv. 24. 16.

Magus: he was born again. But let no man boast, if he have holy Baptism without love: but let all beware, who use holy things not holily<sup>7</sup>." No one can be saved without being regenerate. Simon was baptized, being in a state of hypocrisy and impenitence. But St. Peter did not call on him to be baptized again, and so to be regenerate, but to *repent*<sup>8</sup>. He recognized him as *having been born again*, but as lying in a most dangerous disease of the soul. And unless Simon repented *again*, it would have been *better for that man that he had not been born*<sup>9</sup>. Then, in the words of St. Augustine, "Simon Magus was born of water and the Spirit, but did not enter the kingdom of heaven<sup>1</sup>."

(3) Let the objection be answered from the *practice* of the objectors themselves. Do they *rebaptize* an adult whom they may know to have been baptized without the pre-requisites of Faith and Repentance? No, it is to be hoped, they do not. They dare not do it—unless they become Anabaptists. And what does their *practice* teach? It teaches that God never fails to do His part in the Sacrament, however men may fail in theirs; He does give new birth by baptism: and though that new birth may be abused to a man's own condemnation by him who receives it, yet still it is *given*; and that spiritual birth, like natural birth, is given but *once*: and though it be received amiss, yet by God's mercy on the receiver's *repentance* and *recovery* it *afterwards* becomes *profitable* to his *everlasting salvation*<sup>2</sup>.

(4) Let me also remind the objectors of their own rule. "Our Formularies" (they say) "are to be interpreted

<sup>7</sup> S. Aug. in Ps. ciii., and see S. Aug. c. Don. i. 14, and iv. 28.

<sup>8</sup> Acts viii. 22.

<sup>9</sup> Matt. xxvi. 24.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. c. Don. vi. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Waterland Regeneration stated ii. 3, vol. vi. p. 359, and Bishop Bethell, p. 22.

according to the sense of the *Framers*." No Special Office for *Adult* Baptism existed in the reigns of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth. The Office for Baptism of *Infants* is therefore the *groundwork* for interpreting that for *Adults*; and not *vice versâ*. The present Office for Adults was framed and promulgated at *the last review*. They will therefore interpret it according to the sense of the Bishops and Divines of that period; and *what* that sense was, they well know.

But to return.

After this Conference was held, the Convocation of both Provinces<sup>3</sup> proceeded to review the Book of Common Prayer, and they had it under careful consideration in *twenty-three successive sessions*<sup>4</sup>, and at length, on the 20th of Dec., 1661, they concluded the work with these words, "We, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, and we<sup>5</sup> the Bishops of the same Province, legally convened and assembled in this sacred Provincial Synod, have with one assent and consent, reduced into this present form the Book of COMMON PRAYER and of Administration of Sacraments,

<sup>3</sup> BISHOP PEARSON, who was Prolocutor of the Lower House thus *determined* concerning Baptism, "Nothing in Christianity is more certain than the very great and certain grace of Baptism for spiritual good. Baptism is a visible sign; but that which the sign signifies, is the *invisible grace*; and the sign itself was instituted, that it *might confer that grace*." Bishop Pearson's *Opuscula*, i. p. 313.

<sup>4</sup> The Savoy Conference ended 24th July, 1661. The review of the Prayer Book, began on Thursday, Nov. 21. See Bishop Gibson's *Synodus Anglicana*, p. 84—95. Codex, p. 275, "Dr. Tenison computed that about six hundred alterations were made in the Book of Common Prayer, by the Convocation of 1662." Cardwell Conf. p. 385. Well, therefore, might it be said by Bishop Sander-son, at the close of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, "What is here presented hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces *with great diligence examined and approved*."

<sup>5</sup> See above, Sermon V., p. 105, for the original words.

and have *received* and *approved* the same, and have *subscribed our names thereto*." Thereupon the Clergy of the *Lower House* of Convocation, the same day, received the Book, and they all signified their approval likewise in these words: "We have unanimously consented and subscribed our names thereto<sup>6</sup>." The same proceeding took place in the Province of York.

Thus, then, was the work accomplished by the Church. And, *if no civil* enactment had been passed, yet this spiritual determination was enough to bind the use of the Common Prayer upon "all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious members of the Church of England." But, in addition to this,—legal validity, in civil respects, *was* given to it by the Nation as a State. The thanks of the House of Peers were voted to both Houses of Convocation, and conveyed to them by the Lord Chancellor, Earl Clarendon<sup>7</sup>, "for their great care and industry in reviewing the Book of Common Prayer." The Book was fully approved and allowed by the Crown; and an Act was passed by the Legislature requiring that none should hold any benefice in the Church of England, who did not first declare, "openly and publicly" in the house of God, his "unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing prescribed therein<sup>8</sup>."

In this manner the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER was received, approved, promulgated, and established with one heart, hand, and voice, by the English CHURCH and NATION. And such as the Book of Common Prayer was then, such it remains now.

### 13. Thus we have traced its History from its origin

<sup>6</sup> See the original words and names in Nicholls' Common Prayer, Preface, p. x.

<sup>7</sup> Gibson's Synodus, p. 106.

<sup>8</sup> Act of Uniformity, Sect. iv.

to the present day. Here our argument from *external evidence* is brought to a close.

I now leave it to you, my Brethren, to decide,—Whether it is consistent with Reason, Equity, Charity, or Truth, and whether it is compatible with reverence and gratitude to God, and with allegiance to the Church, to affirm,—that the Framers of the Book of Common Prayer, and they who promulgated it, and delivered it to us, maintained Calvinistic opinions; and that it may be construed in a Calvinistic sense; and that the Baptismal Offices in the Prayer Book may be construed in a hypotheticalal sense, which has been called Calvinistic?

14. We should be very unthankful in the sight of Almighty God, if we could close this enquiry without a solemn ascription of praise to His most glorious Name, for the inestimable blessing which He has vouchsafed and preserved to us in the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER. By its means we have been defended from the great inconvenience, irreverence, and offence of extemporaneous effusions and indigested rhapsodies in His sacred Worship. By it we have been secured from the hollow mockery of tedious and toyish ceremonies, and from the heinous iniquity of superstitious idolatries. In it we possess a *form of sound words*, words drawn, for the most part, from the pure well-spring of Holy Scripture, and from the venerable Liturgies of the Primitive Church. By it, therefore, we hold spiritual communion with Patriarchs and Prophets, with Apostles and Evangelists, with the Holy Men of every age, and with the blessed Angels of Heaven. Therefore we shall not err if, with our Forefathers of old, we attribute this blessing, *not* to the device of *man*, but to the influence of the HOLY GHOST.

*That good thing which was committed unto thee keep*



*by the Holy Ghost.* The same Divine Spirit, Who vouchsafed us this heavenly treasure, has graciously watched over it, ever since the boon was given. If we look back upon the history of the Liturgy and the Church, we recognize clearly the Hand of God. Even in the difficulties, dangers, perplexities, trials, and distresses by which they were beset, we see His Wisdom and Love. If the English Reformation had been hastily hurried to its full and final accomplishment, if it had not been gradually matured with gentleness, wisdom, and moderation, then it is more than probable that the Church of England would have been involved in those dangerous errors, and plunged in those desperate calamities, which we now see and deplore in many of the *foreign* Reformed Churches.

It pleased Divine Providence to vouchsafe to us the sage guidance, and profound learning, and prudent circumspection, and charitable meekness of a Cranmer, at that critical time when Christendom was distracted by so many wild opinions and intemperate spirits. And if this had not been the case, who can say that the Church of England would not have been unmoored from the rock of Scripture and Primitive Antiquity, and drifted about by the winds and waves of strange doctrine, and perhaps stranded at length on the shoals and quicksands of a wavering and negative Christianity?

If, again, the course of our Reformation had not been checked for a time, if the Church of England had not been purified by the fires of the Marian Persecution, then it is but too probable, from the current of events at that time, that she would have fallen a victim of secular and sacrilegious spoliation, and that she would have forfeited the solid and substantial verities of Scriptural and Catholic Christianity for the shadows and phantoms of the Zwinglian heresy, and that she

would have fallen down a dangerous precipice into the deep abyss of a dark and desperate fatalism.

Happily God interfered : He arrested her steps ; and there was great mercy in the check she received. The Prayer Book was plucked, as it were, like a brand from the fires which consumed her Martyrs, in order that it might be preserved in the bosom of her Guardian Spirit, and in God's own time be restored. And when that hour arrived, God raised up for her a wise, courageous, and religious Queen, who was not to be moved from her steadfastness by the fanatical fury of rash and self-idolizing enthusiasts, or daunted by the proud menaces and thundering anathemas of the Bishop of Rome.

At the close of her long, eventful, and glorious reign, another Crisis arose. The Book of Common Prayer appeared to be in jeopardy from the hands of some who desired to change its doctrine and its language. But God raised up for the Church a Princely Protector, even from that very land where Puritanism had taken root and flourished. The Church remained secure ; the Prayer Book was vindicated, confirmed, and amplified in strength and beauty. In the reign of his Son and Successor, a storm broke upon the Commonwealth and the Church ; and in that Great Rebellion the voice of the Prayer Book was heard no more in the Churches of England. But happier, happier far was that silence, than if its doctrines had been corrupted. It slept for a time, to awake with new strength. At the Restoration another assault was made upon it, but that assault was repelled, and it gained vigour and energy from the conflict ; and by the blessing of God, Who then rescued it, it remains to us entire.

Another emergency has now arisen in our own day. It is not, indeed, proposed to mutilate the Prayer Book. The Spirit of Evil has now changed his mode

of attack, he deals with us now more artfully, he suggests a mode of Interpretation which, if it be once admitted, would infuse into it an insidious and subtle poison, which would vitiate the whole.

If the words of the English Church in the English Prayer Book are not to be understood in their plain, simple, literal English sense; if when she says, "Seeing now, dearly beloved, this Child *is* regenerate," she is *not* to be understood to mean that the Child *is* regenerate; then doubt, suspicion, and scepticism will lurk beneath her altars, and steal into the most solemn Mysteries of Religion. Then faith in subscriptions to Articles will be no more; and all confidence in her teaching and in that of her Ministers will be destroyed. And so a grievous penalty will be inflicted on her and them; a heavy injury will be sustained by her People, and the English Name and Nation will sink low in the scale of honesty, sincerity, and truth.

It is not too much to affirm, that if this mode of Interpretation be received, it must undermine the foundations of FAITH, HOPE, and CHARITY. For, if it be a matter of *doubt*, whether we have been born again in Baptism or no, how can we have any certain Faith that we belong to the Body of Christ? And since all Grace on earth, and all happiness in Heaven, depends on our union with Christ, how can we have any solid comfort here, or substantial HOPE of glory hereafter? And if we have not been grafted and planted *together* as *members one of another* in Christ, how can we love one another in Him, how can we *have fervent* CHARITY *one towards another*, as fellow-members in one Body,—the Body of Christ?

If then, this interpretation be once admitted, then all that we speak concerning FAITH, HOPE, and CHARITY, fades like a dream.

Therefore you have now been invited to examine, what are the grounds on which this Interpretation rests.

You have seen how baseless the structure is. Trust not yourselves to so ruinous a habitation. Let me now solemnly remind each of you, that you owe a sacred duty to God, by Whose Spirit you have been born again; you owe a sacred duty to the Church who has borne you in her womb, nursed you at her bosom, and taught you at her knees, to labour faithfully, wisely, zealously, and charitably in your several spheres, and according to your respective abilities, that the danger which now assails us may be averted, that the truth may be vindicated, manifested, and more firmly established. Let us not murmur at our present trial. It is far less than our sins deserve. It is *of the Lord's mercy that we are not consumed, and because His compassions fail not*<sup>9</sup>. *We are not worthy of the least of His mercies*<sup>1</sup>. And if He had dealt with us according to our deserts, and rewarded us according to our iniquities, He would most justly have withdrawn from us our Public Liturgy, and the Christian Sacraments, and His Holy Word—all which we have too little valued, and too much neglected, despised, and abused. Let us, therefore, be thankful to Him for having preserved them to us. Let us pray to Him to continue them to us, and to our children's children. Let us look to Him for aid. And if we do not faint and falter, then we may be sure that the good Providence Which has so long watched over our Country and our Church, and guarded her Liturgy, will not fail us in the hour of trial. *The Lord will not fail His people, nor forsake His inheritance*<sup>2</sup>. Then the storm will be followed by a calm. God will be in *the midst of us, and we shall not be moved. The rivers of the flood shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the Tabernacle of the Most Highest*<sup>3</sup>; for *He is the Lord our God, the Holy One of Israel, our Saviour*<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Lam. iii. 22.<sup>1</sup> Gen. xxxii. 10.<sup>2</sup> Ps. xciv. 14.<sup>3</sup> Ps. xlv. 4.<sup>4</sup> Isa. xliii. 3.

## SERMON VII.<sup>1</sup>

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN 1711 AND 1850.

JOB viii. 8—10.

*Enquire, I pray thee, of the former age, and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers: (for we are but of yesterday, and know nothing, because our days upon earth are a shadow :) shall not they teach thee, and tell thee, and utter words out of their heart ?*

AT the close of the last Discourse, your attention was drawn to the signal manifestations of God's goodness and superintending watchfulness over our CHURCH and LITURGY for many generations; and you were invited to join in an ascription of praise to Him, for His providential care in the continued preservation of these inestimable benefits.

The evidences of this merciful dispensation, to which reference was then made, were derived from a retrospect of the critical emergencies in the History of the Church, from the era of the Reformation to the Restoration, when the Book of Common Prayer was established in its present form, and when the History of its modifications may be said to have reached its close.

Subsequently however to the Restoration, an exigency arose affecting the Liturgy and the Church; and

<sup>1</sup> Preached in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday Morning, April 28, 1850.

it appears to present so many striking features of resemblance to our present position of affairs, that it cannot be unprofitable to look back upon that crisis, and to consider calmly what practical inferences may be deduced from it with respect to our own duties, and what anticipations may be formed from it with regard to the future.

I. They who are conversant with the Ecclesiastical annals of our country, will recognize the allusion which has now been made to the condition of the Church of England in the final years of the last of the Stuarts, and at the commencement of the reign of the first Sovereign of the Hanoverian dynasty.

In the year 1711, a Book<sup>2</sup> was published by a Minister of the Church of England, who was distinguished by ingenuity and learning, but was unhappily notorious for his strong bias in favour of novel and paradoxical opinions. In this publication the Arian Heresy was revived. It was boldly asserted that the false doctrine, which denies the co-existence, co-equality, co-eternity, and consubstantiality of God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, with God the Father, was held by the primitive Church, and was demonstrable from the Word of God.

The Author of this publication did not pretend to reconcile those tenets with the Athanasian Creed<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>2</sup> Concerning this work of the Rev. WILLIAM WHISTON, M.A., "An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity revived," and the proceedings in Convocation connected with it, see Bishop Burnet's *Own Time*, ii. 571—573. 603, or vi. 48—52 and 113, ed. Oxf. 1823. Whiston's *Memoirs*, i. 177. 196. 217. Pfaffii *Introd.* in *Hist. Theol. Lib.* iii. p. 274. Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, i. p. 498. Cardwell's *Synodalia*, ii. 753—769.

<sup>3</sup> The Archbishop and Bishops thus speak, in their address to the Crown: "The Author has advanced herein several damnable and blasphemous assertions against the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity, expressly contradicting the Nicene Creed, and defaming the

nor with the teaching of the Church of England in her Liturgy and Articles; but he ventured to affirm, that there was a departure, in that Creed and in those Formularies, from the spirit and letter of Scripture, and from the Faith of the primitive Church.

The Book in which he propounded these pernicious opinions was inscribed by him to the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy assembled in a Convocation, which had been specially convened and charged by the Crown<sup>4</sup> to "draw up a Representation of the then state of Religion, with regard to the recent excessive growth of Infidelity and Heresy."

In consequence of this Royal mandate, the Convocation proceeded to examine the Book which was dedicated to them; and, having extracted from it the most obnoxious paragraphs, they censured and condemned the assertions therein contained "as false and heretical, injurious to Our Saviour and the Holy Spirit, repugnant to the Holy Scriptures, and contrariant to the decrees of the two first GENERAL COUNCILS, and to the LITURGY and ARTICLES of our Church<sup>5</sup>."

This Judgment was pronounced, in order "either to the amendment of the author, or to his exclusion from the communion of the Church of England<sup>6</sup>;" and, having been formally recorded, it was presented for ratification to the Crown.

That ratification, however, was not given; and although a second appeal was made for that exercise of the Ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown, the fiat was never issued<sup>7</sup>.

whole Athanasian, and has had the confidence to inscribe the said Preface to the Convocation." Synod. p. 759.

<sup>4</sup> In "The Queen's license and heads of business to the Convocation," dated 29th Jan. 1710, Synodal. ii. p. 731.

<sup>5</sup> Synod. p. 767.

<sup>6</sup> Synod. p. 759.

<sup>7</sup> Burnet, vi. 52. 113.

Thus, then, the Church of England appeared to be reduced to the condition of either having no explicit doctrine concerning the most vital articles of the Faith, namely, with regard to the Holy Trinity in Unity, and to the Deity of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; or of not being able or willing to declare that doctrine by her accredited authorities, and to correct those of her Ministers who openly denied it. In a word, the fundamental verities, for which the first two General Councils of the Church had been convened, seemed to be regarded as *indifferent*, and to be left as *open questions*, to be maintained, or not, by her Ministers, at their own private discretion.

II. Nor was this all. In the following year, another Publication of a similar nature, ushered in and encouraged by its predecessor, appeared in the world.

This second Work was from a still more celebrated person<sup>8</sup>; one distinguished by his station in the Church, and by his intellectual abilities and acquirements. He did not, indeed, speak in the same bold and uncompromising tone as the Author who had led the way; he pursued another course, less alarming in appearance, but far more dangerous in reality; he exerted the most specious ingenuity and subtle dexterity, in an elaborate endeavour to shew, that the tenets which he had

<sup>8</sup> On this work, "The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, &c., by SAMUEL CLARKE, D.D., Rector of St. James', Westminster, Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty;" and on the proceedings in Convocation connected with it, see Bishop Van Mildert's Life of Dr. Waterland, p. 44; Cardwell Synod. 785—793. In the year 1774 appeared "the Book of Common Prayer, reformed according to the plan of the late Dr. Samuel Clarke, by Theophilus Lindsey."

It is observable that Dr. Clarke's opinions concerning the Trinity, and our Blessed Lord, led him, by a natural consequence, to misrepresent the Sacrament of Baptism, as appears from his Exposition of the Church Catechism, which was also censured by Waterland, in his treatise "On the Christian Sacraments," v. p. 464,—a work very suitable to the present times.



espoused might be reconciled with the public use of the Liturgy of the Church, and with honest subscription to her Articles<sup>9</sup>. He pleaded that those Formularies and Articles might be received in any sense which he who received and subscribed them regarded as consistent with Scripture, and that, whatever the person so receiving and subscribing them supposed to be the sense of Scripture, *that* was the sense to which his subscription should be regarded as made.

This novel theory of subscription found many adherents among those who entertained Arian opinions, and was openly defended by them<sup>1</sup>.

Here then was another danger; one not only affecting the Faith, but undermining the Morality, of the Church.

The Book in which these opinions were promulgated was also brought under the cognizance of the Convocation, and was censured by the Lower House in an Address to the Upper; soon after which, the Author tendered an explanatory declaration of his opinions, which had the effect of staying further proceedings in the Upper House, but was rejected by the Lower as "not containing any recantation of his heretical assertions<sup>2</sup>."

Here then another difficulty arose, from the dissension of the two houses; and no further synodical proceedings took place with regard to this question.

III. From this complication of difficulties the most disastrous consequences might have been apprehended.

The Church of England appeared to be unable to vindicate an essential Article of the Christian Faith

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. pp. 45. 75—88, and Waterland's Works, ii. pp. 281—367.

<sup>1</sup> See Waterland's Life, by Bishop Van Mildert, p. 80. Works, ii. 281.

<sup>2</sup> Synod. p. 789, note.

which had been publicly assailed by some of her own Ministers. A great triumph was thus given to Indifference, Latitudinarianism, and Infidelity; many were heard to affirm that the sacred doctrines of the Church depended solely on the will<sup>3</sup> of human authority. A wide door was opened for the propagation of Heretical opinions, which were disseminated by some of her Clergy<sup>4</sup>. The renunciation of the plain, natural sense of the Liturgical Offices, and Articles of Religion, and the laxity and disingenuousness of the theory, by which subscription to public professions of Faith was rendered an idle mockery, exposed the Ministers of the Church, who resorted to such a subterfuge, to just indignation and scorn, and involved the Church herself in the obloquy and discredit which attached to their practices. In addition to this, the divisions of the Church, as seen in her public Synods as well as among her individual Ministers, crippled her energies, wasted her strength, and disabled her from discharging with zeal, faithfulness, and energy the great practical duties of evangelical piety and holiness, and gave much scandal to her friends, while they afforded great *occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme*.

These melancholy circumstances exhibited the evil effects of human corruption, and the subtle machina-

<sup>3</sup> Compare Towgood's *Dissent justified*, Lond. 1787, pp. 29. 283.

<sup>4</sup> "Divers impious tenets and doctrines have been of late advanced and maintained with much boldness and openness, contrary to the great and fundamental truths of the Christian Religion, and particularly to the doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity, and moreover divers Persons, as well of the *Clergy* as Laity, have presumed to propagate such impious doctrines, not only by public discourse, but also by publishing books and pamphlets in opposition to the said sacred truths." Letter of KING GEORGE I. to the ARCHBISHOPS and BISHOPS of England and Wales, May 7, 1721.

tions of the great Enemy of man against the peace and happiness of the Church.

But the power of GOD was manifested in man's weakness, and the love of God was rendered more conspicuous, amid the strifes of contending parties.

1. In His great goodness to us, He preserved the LITURGY entire; and then it was clearly seen, how great that blessing is. *If* the Church of England had followed the example of other Protestant Communities; if she had *abandoned* the use of *set forms of public prayer*, and had trusted herself to the extemporaneous gifts of her Ministers in the Public Worship of God; it is easy to perceive, that at such a crisis as that which we have been contemplating, her religious assemblies would have presented the aspect of a confusion of tongues. But the Spirit of truth, love, and peace breathed in her Offices of religion, and exercised a salutary influence and control upon her Ministers, and guided the minds and soothed the hearts of her Children. *If*, again, the Church of England,—as some other communions have done,—had cut herself off from the Ancient Church, by discarding the Apostles' Creed, and the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, then her people would have been left almost without Chart or Compass, in the troubled sea of controversy, which threatened to plunge them in the gulph; and many would have made shipwreck of their Faith in the great Doctrine of the Trinity. But in those holy symbols of the true Faith, and in her solemn Litanies, and in the Administration of her Sacraments, and in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, she held steadily before their eyes a clear profession, concerning the Trinity in Unity, and the Godhead of the Son and Holy Ghost; and thus, however ambiguous and defective, however erroneous and dangerous, the teaching of some of her Ministers might be (and, in

some cases, most erroneous and dangerous that teaching *was*); however fraudulent the artifices by which they sought to elude the plain drift of the most solemn words, yet those very Ministers carried in their hands the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, they rehearsed it weekly in the Church in the ears of the People; and so they condemned their own errors with their own mouths whenever they rehearsed the Athanasian Creed, or celebrated the Sacraments, or recited the Litany of the Church; and thus, by God's mercy overruling their bad practices, they warned the people against their own evil teaching, they supplied the antidote to their own poison, and vindicated the Church of England in the treachery of their own acts.

2. Nor was this all the benefit which was provided by Almighty God, at that critical emergency. The discussion of the great questions at issue awakened a spirit of enquiry among the people. They heard the arguments on both sides, and judged accordingly. God raised up many able men among the Clergy, to defend the faith which had been assailed, and to place it on a firmer basis than before. He enabled them to confound the sophistical subtleties, by which some had sought to find a specious pretext for prevarication, equivocation, and mental reserve in public subscriptions to Formularies of faith, and in the use of the Liturgical Offices. He blessed the Church with a Waterland. Nor were there wanting among the faithful Laity, some who nobly distinguished themselves in that hour of peril in the cause of religion and morality. The names of a Nottingham and a Nelson<sup>5</sup> will ever

<sup>5</sup> The Earl of Nottingham (who received the thanks of both Universities) and Robert Nelson, Esq. Bishop Van Mildert's *Life of Waterland*, pp. 32. 46. Bishop Monk's *Life of Bentley*, ii. p. 141. Aubrey's *Letters*, II. p. 65. Walpole's *Royal and Noble Authors*, iv. p. 118. The foundation of the Lady Moyer Lectures

be memorable in the annals of the English Church, for the services rendered by them in that time of trial.

3. At length, after a long struggle, the Truth prevailed. Ten years elapsed from the time in which, as far as certain outward appearances were concerned, the doctrine of the Trinity itself, and the Divinity of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, had been treated as *open questions*, and in which a Minister of the Church had been permitted to deny those doctrines, and to dedicate his impiety to the Church in Convocation, and to escape without censure.

When those ten years of conflict had expired, the truth, as taught in the Liturgy and Articles of the Church, was proclaimed by the Supreme Authority of the Realm. The Sovereign arose spontaneously from the throne, and, "out of his princely care and zeal for preserving the purity of the Christian Faith, of which he was, under God, the Chief Defender," addressed the Prelates of the land, and exhorted them to take care that no Minister of the Church should deliver any doctrines concerning the fundamental truths of our most holy religion, and particularly concerning the Blessed Trinity, than what are contained in the Holy Scriptures, and agreeable to the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion<sup>6</sup>.

These commands for the *maintenance* of the *ancient*

in defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, dates from this period. Waterland was the first Lecturer, 1719-20.

<sup>6</sup> See the King's Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops, "for the preserving of Unity in the Church and the Purity of the Christian Faith, particularly in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity." The letter is dated St. James's, 7th May, 1721. It is inserted in Pfaffii Hist. Theol. Lib. iii. pp. 279—282.

"Ex his (literis) constat (says the learned Historian) Arianismum et Socinianismum in Anglicanâ Ecclesiâ non tolerari," p. 284.

faith of the Church were signified by the Bishops to the Clergy of their respective dioceses, and thus the Royal and Episcopal Power were happily seen united (as God grant they ever may be!) in upholding the Truth in Christ.

Thus the cloud was dispersed. The unjust charge of indifference was removed from the Church. Reparation was made her by the Crown, for the wrong she had suffered. Sound doctrine was retrieved. And we have reason to bless God, that since the struggle of those days, the Articles of the Faith, which were then the subject of controversy, have remained settled among us; and whatever difference may exist among the Members and Ministers of the Church of England, this at least, we trust, may be said, that we have but one faith in our hearts, and hear but one doctrine from our Pulpits, at our Altars, and at our Fonts, with respect to the Ever-blessed Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

IV. Let us now review these circumstances with reference to our present position; and let us consider the practical suggestions which they offer to ourselves.

So dangerous a complication of events as that which we have just been considering, could not have arisen without long *previous* neglect and delinquency on the part of the Members, Ministers, and Rulers of the Church. It dated from a period far back. At the time of the Restoration a libertine spirit prevailed widely among us; and it could not be supposed that where morals were depraved, purity of doctrine should subsist. Doubtless, many there were, who contended earnestly for the Faith, but public virtue had declined, licentiousness was dominant, and the arts of poetry and philosophy were perverted to ridicule the mysteries of Religion. A cold scepticism stole over the Nation's

heart<sup>7</sup>. And when it became necessary to apply the remedy, it was found that the disease was too potent to admit a ready cure.

The secret of the reluctance felt by those in authority to pronounce sentence of condemnation on the Author of the heretical book to which I have referred, will be found in the long anterior vigorous growth of unsound doctrine, which then had become so inveterate that the Physicians of the Body politic and ecclesiastical shrunk with dread from the experiment of grappling with and eradicating the disease.

Here is one point of resemblance to our own case.

1. The seeds of our *present* evils have been long sown. We have been faithless to God in the great concern of the Sacraments of Christ. To speak specially of the Sacrament of Baptism. The aspect of Society shews, that we do not bear about with us habitually the conviction, that our Baptismal vows are ever upon us. How little do we appear to reflect that we have solemnly renounced the world, the flesh, and the devil; and that we are pledged to fight manfully under the banner of Christ, and to continue His faithful soldiers unto our life's end! We *may* have *believed* the *doctrine* of Baptismal Regeneration, but what profit is that belief, if this great truth has lain bed-ridden in our souls? It stands in our Prayer Books; it may be on our lips, but it has not lived and moved in our hearts, it has not governed our lives.

Vain is the orthodoxy of the letter, if it produce not

<sup>7</sup> "The Representation on the State of Religion," drawn up (in pursuance of the Queen's Command,) by Atterbury, as Prolocutor of the Lower House, and reviewed and approved by that House, is in some respects overcharged: but it is true in the main; the statement of Bentley (who was of a very different school) is not more favourable, see his Correspondence, i. p. 39. Atterbury's Representation is printed in his Correspondence, ii. pp. 315—350.

the fruits of the spirit. It is only a barren fig-tree with luxuriant leaves, which is *nigh unto cursing*<sup>8</sup>, and to be withered by the breath of Christ.

2. Much, also, may we blame ourselves in other respects, with regard to the Sacrament of Baptism. Our Lord sets this Sacrament at the very door and vestibule of His Church. No one can pass by it unheeded. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* Thus the Baptismal Font is placed by Christ like the *crystal sea* before the Throne of God<sup>9</sup>. But we have too often concealed this Sacrament, as if we were ashamed of it. We have administered it in secret corners or in empty Churches. Our congregations have become impatient of hearing the blessed words in which Christ promises grace; they have stopped their ears, and turned their eyes away from Him, while embracing His little ones with the arms of His mercy, and laying His Hands on them and blessing them. They *have rebuked those that brought them*. And some have been heard, even among the Ministers of the Church, the professed Disciples of Christ and Teachers of His Gospel, to speak words of disparagement concerning this holy mystery, as if God refused to work in the Sacraments of His Dear Son: and as if Christ, Who is the Truth, could cheat us with vain shadows, and mock us with empty dreams, or could be displeased with His own appointments, and be untrue to His own promises.

3. Again: another point.

Great and well-merited are the complaints which have been uttered by some of our wisest Prelates, concerning the neglect of Catechizing in our Churches and Grammar Schools, and on the suppression of

<sup>8</sup> Heb. vi. 8.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. iv. 6.



Catechetical Lectures in our Colleges and Universities. Hence many generations have been suffered to grow up among us without adequate instruction and admonition, concerning the vows by which they were pledged, and the privileges to which they were admitted, at their Baptism.

Still further :

4. There is one public calamity which must not be omitted here. The Sacrament of Baptism has been displaced from the position which it till lately held in this Christian Land. A system of secular *Registration* has almost supplanted it among a large portion of the lower classes of this Metropolis and the community generally; and it is to be feared that, unless active measures are adopted to remedy this evil, the tendency of that Registration will be to deter thousands from bringing their children to be baptized, and to exclude the names of many of our poorer brethren from the Book of Life,—and (much more) to exclude those, who place them in peril of such exclusion. This is a tremendous evil. It is a sin against Him Who instituted the Sacrament of Baptism. And can it be matter of surprise, that God should hide His Face from us, that He should suffer many of us to lose our way, and to *grope at mid-day*, and to wander far from the truth with regard to the Sacrament we have despised?

V. Therefore, may we not justly enquire, whether the trial which has now overtaken us, be not a just retribution for our public and private sins, not of to-day or yesterday, but during many years, in respect to this vital Article of the Christian Faith? *O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our Kings, to our Princes, and to our Fathers, because we have sinned against Thee, neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in His laws, which He set before us. Therefore the curse is poured upon us, and He hath confirmed His*

*word against us, and against our judges who judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil*<sup>1</sup>.

1. If this be a true view of the case, then we have no great cause for wonder, that a crisis like the present should have arisen; we ought rather to regard it as the natural consequence of a disorder which has long been lurking within us; we ought to enquire, what *good* is designed by God to be educed by us from this dispensation. We ought to consider it as an occasion for self-abasement, and repentance, and as a call for earnest resolutions and prayers and endeavours for amendment: and not for angry censure and irritable impatience against those who may have been employed as instruments for chastising and correcting us for our sins.

2. If also this representation be true, then we should reasonably expect, that our restoration and recovery will not be accomplished in a day. It must be a work of time, it must be the result of much patience, diligence, and love: it must be the fruit of many prayers. We must not be cast down by disappointments, nor faint by reason of embarrassments: we must expect to be often thwarted and baffled, before the victory is won.

3. The history of the past times, which we have been contemplating, teaches us not to be too sanguine with regard to any specific expedient.

Some persons have imagined, that if a CONVOCATION of the Church were assembled, all our difficulties would vanish.

Great, indeed, is the debt of gratitude which we owe, under God, to the venerable Synods of Christian Antiquity; and very great are our obligations, as the history of our Liturgy shews, to the Convocations of our own land.

<sup>1</sup> Dan. ix. 8—12.

But we must recollect, that the circumstances of the Nineteenth century are widely different from those of the Fourth. We require no new Creeds. "Let the Ancient Customs prevail." And our Liturgy and Articles are now, we trust, finally settled; Heaven forbid that any man should tamper with them.

We may, perhaps, have more reason than some of us suppose, to thank God, not only for what we *can*, but for what we *cannot*, do. What a blessing would it have been for the Church of Rome, if her synods at Constance and Basle had never met! What a blessing would it have been for her and for the world, if the Council of Trent had been *impossible*! *We* have great reason to thank God, that we possess our Liturgy and Articles, and we have also great cause to thank Him, that none among us, who may desire to do so, possesses the power of altering them.

Besides, though we do not presume to say that the Convocation might not be a serviceable instrument at the present juncture, let none of us be too confident that it would be, lest, if their remedy should fail, they should haply be reduced to despair.

In one of the emergencies which we have just been considering, a Judgment was pronounced by Convocation, but that Judgment was never ratified, and did not take effect. In the other case, the Convocation itself was divided. Therefore, in neither case was the instrumentality of the Convocation effective in extricating the Church from her difficulty. The result might be similar under existing circumstances, or it might not. No one among us can tell.

#### 4. What then is the Remedy?

First of all, Trust in God. *Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him*<sup>2</sup>. *Put thou thy trust in the Lord, and be doing good: commit thy way unto the Lord,*

<sup>2</sup> Ps. ii. 12.

*and He shall bring it to pass*<sup>3</sup>. *Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and He shall nourish thee, and shall not suffer the righteous to fall for ever*<sup>4</sup>. *I will not trust in my bow, it is not my sword that shall help me, but it is Thou that savest us from our enemies, and puttest them to confusion that hate us*<sup>5</sup>. Christ, let us be sure, watches over His Church. *The Lord loveth the gates of Sion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. Very excellent things are spoken of thee, thou City of God*<sup>6</sup>. *No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper*<sup>7</sup>. And it is the voice of the Spirit which says, *Let them be confounded and turned backward, as many as have evil will at Sion*<sup>8</sup>. *God helpeth them to right that suffer wrong, and in due time, though the truth, as taught in the Church, be now over-clouded with misrepresentations, yet God will make her righteousness as clear as the light, and her just dealing as the noon-day*<sup>9</sup>.

5. Next, Let us derive comfort and confidence from the preservation, and public use, of one of the purest Liturgies in the world.

With this Book in our hands, and the Spirit of God in our hearts, we can never fail. Some among us have asked, "Why is the Church mute in the present Crisis? Why does not the Church speak?" Whatever she may be about to do, it is not for us to say; but this we confidently reply, that she *does* speak—speak loudly and clearly—daily and hourly, in her Book of Common Prayer. And to those who have neither ears to hear, nor hearts to believe, it would be of little avail that she spoke more distinctly than she does. Yes, we say, she speaks by her Liturgy, which her Ministers hold in their hands, and proclaim with their mouths, and to which they give their unfeigned assent in the house of

<sup>3</sup> Ps. xxxvii. 3. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Ps. lv. 22.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. xlv. 7, 8.

<sup>6</sup> Ps. lxxxvii. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Ps. liv. 17.

<sup>8</sup> Ps. cxxix. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Ps. cxlvi. 6; cxxxvii. 6.

God. Every time that a Baptism is administered, the Church speaks; every time that a child is catechized in her Churches and her Schools, every time that a Confirmation is solemnized, the Church uplifts her voice. Thus *Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets: she crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the openings of the gates: in the city she uttereth her words, saying, How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my spirit upon you, I will make known my words unto you*<sup>1</sup>.

It was by the clearness of her statements in her BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, on the great doctrines of the Trinity, and of the Godhead of the Son and the Holy Ghost, that the Church was preserved from the Arian heresy in the last Century; and, by the Blessing of God, her equally explicit language on the Sacrament of Baptism in her incomparable Liturgy, will defend her now from the Calvinistic and Zwinglian heresies with regard to that Sacrament.

6. Another important lesson to be derived from the history we have been considering is this,—

At that critical period to which we have referred, an occasion was ministered to the *enemies* of the Church to say, that she was the creature and slave of the secular power,—that her faith hung on the lips of an earthly Sovereign,—that the great doctrine of the Trinity was treated by her with indifference, and that the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit was left an open question, to be affirmed or denied at pleasure by the Ministers of the Church.

But what was the conduct of the great Divines of that day?

Did they admit the charge? did they *separate*

<sup>1</sup> Prov. i. 20—23.

themselves from the Church, and allow that the Church of England had forfeited her Catholicity? that she had no longer the power of ministering the means of grace to her people? or did any of them ever dream (as some would now advise) of resorting to Rome as a "Final Court of Appeal in matters of Faith?"

No. God forbid! They knew full well that it is no new thing for a Church to be misrepresented by those who bear office in it. They remembered that the Church of Israel had been misrepresented by ungodly Kings and false Prophets. But they also knew that the *true* Prophets had never severed themselves from the Church. They knew that the same Church had been misrepresented by heretical Sadducees and hypocritical Pharisees in the age of our Lord, but that Christ communicated with it.

Such was *their* conduct. And are *we* holier than they? Who among us now can boast of greater disinterestedness<sup>2</sup>, of more singleness of purpose, of stricter orthodoxy, and of deeper insight into Christian antiquity, and the principles of the primitive Church, than are associated, and ever will be, with the name of Waterland? And it is a remarkable fact, that the person who is now universally acknowledged to have been one of the most profound thinkers, and one of the ablest defenders of Revealed Religion that any Nation has produced, *quitted* the ranks of *Non-conformity*, and *joined* the *Church of England*, and commenced his ministry in her communion, at that very time when this controversy was at its height,—the ever-memorable Bishop Butler<sup>3</sup>.

These holy and learned men knew well, and bitterly mourned at what they knew, that there were Ministers

<sup>2</sup> He declined a Bishoprick; see the tribute to his memory by Archbishop Potter, *Life*, i. p. 331.

<sup>3</sup> He began to preach at the Rolls, in 1718.

in the Church of England holding Arian opinions, and publishing them to the world. They deplored that discipline was enfeebled and the Faith exposed to peril by some who had sworn to defend it. They wept, as St. John wept over the Church of Thyatira, in which a *Jezebel was suffered to teach*<sup>4</sup>. But they did not break the Unity of the Church. They remembered that those same Arian Ministers had in their hands the Book of Common Prayer; that they uttered with their lips its Creeds and Prayers, and had solemnly given their assent to all its contents. They remembered that Arian Bishops<sup>5</sup> were received into communion at the Council of Nicæa, on their subscribing the Nicene Creed. They therefore knew these Ministers as openly holding in their hands the profession of the true faith, and as bound by the most sacred obligations in the face of God and man to teach the doctrines contained therein. They deplored and abhorred their erroneous interpretations; they did not communicate with them in their sins, but they communicated in the truth, which by the most solemn stipulations they had all pledged themselves to uphold.

With regard to the Church herself, these pious and learned men, to whom we refer, were far from admitting that she had left the doctrine of the Trinity, or any other great Christian verity, an open question. They boldly denied the charge. They said that the true

<sup>4</sup> Rev. ii. 20.

<sup>5</sup> S. Hieron. c. Lucifer. iv. p. 300, thus writes, "In the Nicene Council, (A.D. 325) which was convened to suppress Arianism, eight Arian Bishops were received into Communion, and there is now no Bishop in the world, which that Council did not ordain." He then mentions the names of the Bishops, among whom were Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Eusebius of Cæsarea. Cf. Theodoret. Eccl. Hist. i. 19, 20, and Natalis, H. E. vii. p. 65. "These Bishops subscribed the Creed, but insincerely. Of one he says, 'Fictè fraudulenterque subscripsit, homo semper Arianus.'" See also *ibid.* p. 456.

judgment of the Church had been suppressed and stifled, and that she had been misrepresented. They loved the Church more dearly because she was wronged. They claved to her more stedfastly because she needed their aid. They strove earnestly to clear her from the unjust imputation of ambiguity under which she laboured. They endeavoured to obtain restitution and satisfaction for her. They therefore pointed to her Book of Common Prayer. There, they said, is the Voice of the Church. All her Ministers, all her Members, are bound to hear that. Is that ambiguous?

No, it is not.

Such was their language and practice. And God aided their labours. The Eternal Trinity blessed them. After a conflict of ten years the public mind was restored to a sounder state. The Arian heresy was publicly proscribed as impious by the Supreme Authority of the Realm; the true doctrine of the Holy and Ever-Blessed Trinity, as taught by the Church, was vindicated; the Church was recognized by the Crown as the faithful witness of the truth. Justice was done her. And it is a debt which will be long remembered as due to the first Sovereign of that Dynasty, which may God long preserve on the Throne of England! that he thus exercised his Princely power in a manner which might best commend him to the blessing of Heaven, and which best became him as "Defender of the Faith."

Let me leave it to you, my brethren, to make the obvious application of these last remarks to our present condition: and, in conclusion, let me offer one admonition derived from the aspect of the times in which our lot is cast.

7. Our Lord has warned us that, in the last age of the world, the Faith will be hard to find<sup>6</sup>. *The time will*

<sup>6</sup> Luke xviii. 8.



come, says the Apostle, *when men will not endure sound doctrine*<sup>7</sup>. Doubtless the truth will always subsist in the Christian Church, by reason of Christ's promise to her, and presence with her, but it will be clouded over with dark mists. *The Sun shall be darkened*<sup>8</sup>—that is, CHRIST Himself will be denied by many; *the Moon shall not give her light*—that is, the Church, which derives her light from Christ, will be veiled and obscured by misrepresentations: and then the rest of the prophecy will be fulfilled, *the Stars shall fall from heaven*: that is, many of her members, many of her ministers, some of *her burning and shining lights*, will fall from their place. Being offended by personal defects in her Executive, or by maladministration of her laws, they will fall from their station in her firmament, and plunge themselves in gloom.

Let us not be perplexed by this; let us not be staggered or confounded. It has been foretold by Christ. And He has also said: *In patience possess ye your souls. He that endureth to the end shall be saved*<sup>9</sup>.

Almighty God may, for the just punishment of the World, be about to permit a decomposition of the Polity of Nations. He may be about to suffer that the framework of society should be disorganized and dissolved.

What we see in other countries may make us forebode such a result. It may be, that it will be very difficult for men to act together in corporate societies for good. It may be, that they will not be able to lean for aid on the arm of the Law. Every one may find himself thrown immediately on his own resources, and the aid of God.

In such a condition of affairs, the work of Govern-

<sup>7</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. xxiv. 29.

<sup>9</sup> Luke xxi. 19. Matt. x. 22.

ment will be full of difficulty. The relations of civil and ecclesiastical affairs will become more intricate and perplexing. Flaws and blemishes of administration will be more numerous. Patience will be severely tried.

But no one need, therefore, be dismayed. Life is a state of trial. Our trials prepare us for heaven. We may trust that the same Divine Power, Which has preserved to us our Liturgy for so many generations, will still continue to protect it. And we are *sure*, that the Scriptures will remain entire till the Last Day. *The Word of God abideth for ever*<sup>1</sup>. The two Sacraments will continue to be administered by a lawfully ordained Priesthood *till the Lord come*<sup>2</sup>. No earthly power can alter a syllable in the three Creeds, which have been received by the Universal Church, *which is the House of God, the Pillar and the Ground of the truth*<sup>3</sup>. Therefore there can be no cause for schism, none for despondency. The age in which we live is one in which we pass through a fierce ordeal. Now is the world's winnowing. Every man is sifted. It is proved, whether he is good grain. But this state of things has great advantages. It is far better than one of apathy. It brings the truth home to the mind of every one who reflects. It searches every one, whether he has *an honest and good heart*<sup>4</sup>. It calls on *every one to be fully persuaded in his own mind*<sup>5</sup>. It prepares us all for that Great Day, when the Judge will stand with *His fan in His hand, and will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather the wheat into the garner, but will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire*<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. v. 23.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 26. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Luke xviii. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Rom. xiv. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. iii. 12.

## SERMON VIII.<sup>1</sup>

---

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME  
IN 1850.

---

REVELATION OF ST. JOHN ii. 11.

*Hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.*

As the world draws nearer to a close, so the uses of Scripture Prophecy become more apparent. The fulfilment of its predictions adds strength to the evidence of Christianity, and fortifies the faith of the believer. Nor is this all. Prophecy has also a didactic use. It not only foretels that certain events will take place, but it gives us counsel how to act when those circumstances arise. Thus our Lord not only says, *Now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe*<sup>2</sup>; but He also says, *These things have I spoken unto you that ye should not be offended*<sup>3</sup>. And, *he that endureth to the end shall be saved*<sup>4</sup>.

The APOCALYPSE is the only prophetic book of the New Testament. It is to the Church of Christ what the writings of Isaiah and the other ancient Prophets were to the Hebrews. It is like the farewell voice of

<sup>1</sup> Preached in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday afternoon, April 28, 1850.

<sup>2</sup> John xiv. 29.

<sup>3</sup> John xvi. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. x. 22.

the Spirit to the world. It comes to us from the hand of the last surviving Apostle, the beloved Disciple *who leaned on Jesus' Breast at Supper*<sup>5</sup>; who alone of the Apostles stood by the Cross of Christ, and saw His precious Side pierced; and to whom our Lord with His dying Voice committed His Mother, and who *took her unto his own home*<sup>6</sup>, and who was an Exile and a Confessor for the truth in Christ<sup>7</sup>.

The *other* Apostles, and especially St. Paul, were inspired to indite Epistles on the abstruser questions of Christian Doctrine; but *St. John's* spirit was not argumentative, it was a spirit of patience, mildness, gentleness, and love. His theme is charity: and almost all his writings are of an hortatory and practical character.

This description is particularly applicable to the Book of Revelation. Its language is indeed figurative, its imagery is sublime and mysterious, and it requires to be studied with great caution, sobriety, and reverence<sup>8</sup>. But, it may be truly said, that every sentence,—almost every word,—of this Divine Book, bears marks of wonderful precision. The Apocalypse cannot be better described than as a Manual for Christians in every age, and especially in these latter days; and as the time of the end approaches nearer and nearer, so will its *practical* character be recognized more and more by every faithful, thoughtful, and earnest Disciple of Jesus Christ.

This statement may be confirmed by reference to the present condition of the Church of England; and it is now my purpose to shew, that, in our existing circumstances, which have caused disquietude and per-

<sup>5</sup> John xxi. 20.

<sup>6</sup> John xix. 34, 35.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. i. 9.

<sup>8</sup> And, let me here add, with constant attention to the words of the Original, or a faithful translation of them, as ascertained from careful collation of Manuscripts.

plexity to some, we have a safe, because an inspired, Guide, in the APOSTLE ST. JOHN; and that we all may receive comfort and guidance from above, if we listen with attentive ears to what, by his mouth, the SPIRIT *saith unto the Churches*.

1. The Christian Church was instituted for the maintenance and manifestation of the Faith. She is called in Scripture *the Pillar and the Ground of the Truth*<sup>9</sup>, *the Salt of the earth*<sup>1</sup>, *a City set upon a hill that cannot be hid*<sup>2</sup>. And the Churches of Christendom are represented in the Apocalypse as golden Candlesticks, burning with the light of pure doctrine; and amid them Christ walks<sup>3</sup>. Hence it cannot be matter of surprise, that persons of fervent piety should feel sad and distressed, when the Church, of which they are members, appears to be reduced to a condition at variance with these Scriptural characteristics of a Church, either through suppression of true Doctrine, or by connivance at what is false, or by seeming to leave it indifferent, and to be decided by the private judgment of her Ministers, whether they will teach or deny some cardinal Article of Christianity.

2. If we look at the present position of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, it cannot be denied, that she is made to say, by the voice of her Supreme Governor under Christ, that the Teaching of the Doctrine of Regeneration by Baptism is not necessary to the right discharge of ministerial functions in her Communion, and that a contrary Doctrine may be lawfully maintained.

The Church of England is made in appearance to avow that she has spoken ambiguously concerning the effect of the Sacrament of Baptism, which the Apostle St. Paul declares to be one of the first *principles of the doctrine of Christ*<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. v. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. v. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. i. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. vi. 1, 2.

Thus she seems to be placed in the condition of having failed, and of confessing that she has failed, in the discharge of that sacred duty for which the Church exists,—the maintenance and manifestation of the Faith.

Such being the case, a feeling of doubt and distrust has entered into the hearts of some of her members and of her Ministers. They have questioned, whether they can safely remain under her guidance and in her communion. They openly ask, What *other* fundamental Article of Christianity will *next* be declared to be an *open question* in the Church of England? They proceed to deliberate, Whether it be not their duty to separate from the communion of all who may have been instrumental in placing the Church in her present predicament? Thus estrangements ensue, divisions are multiplied, love languishes, works of charity grow slack, society is disorganized, and *men's hearts are failing them for fear, for looking after those things which are coming on the earth*<sup>5</sup>.

3. Nor is this the whole of the evil. The zealous Members and eminent Ministers of the Church of Rome take occasion from these circumstances to utter words of disdain and rebuke against the Church of England. Can the Church of England (they ask)<sup>6</sup> be now left in so isolated and distressed a condition, “can she be, as men speak for her, *trampled under foot*? can she be on the *point of being extinguished*? can the most solemn doctrines be, as it were, slipping from her hand, torn thence by the cruel grasp of her enemies, and does she cry out,—and not one response?” “*Is this* (they enquire) *the kingdom of God*’?” *Is this the*

<sup>5</sup> Luke xxi. 26.

<sup>6</sup> See p. 32 of the Sermon mentioned below, p. 194, note <sup>9</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 4.

*City that men called the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth*<sup>8</sup>? Is this the Spouse of Christ, the Feeder of His Sheep, the Guardian of His little ones? It has been pronounced by her accredited Representative, that "it is indifferent to the Church whether a person holds one doctrine concerning Baptismal Regeneration, or the very opposite<sup>9</sup>." If so, where is her faith? where the healthful food of sound Doctrine? And is this the spiritual Sion, *a City at unity with itself*<sup>1</sup>? If so, how is it she is so rent by divisions? *Can this be the Kingdom of Christ which is not of this world*<sup>2</sup>?" How is it then, that she consents to plead before a Secular Tribunal, and to stand there for sentence of Judgment, and receive her doctrine from its decrees?

The Church of Rome then proceeds to *contrast herself* with the Church of England. She speaks of her own Unity. All her members are in communion with one spiritual head. If a question arise concerning a matter of doctrine, an appeal is made to the Bishop of Rome, who claims to be successor of St. Peter, and the Vicar of Christ upon Earth. His voice is heard, the cause is judged, and doubt and debate are at an end<sup>3</sup>.

What, then, (she asks,) can be more clear, than that the present dissensions in the Church of England, and her inability to compose them, and to declare the truth concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, arise from the unhappy severance, by which she has cut herself off from the centre of Unity? and that her only resource in her time of need is a return to the bosom of the Catholic Church<sup>4</sup>, and that it now remains to be seen whether "England, or what *calls itself her Church*, will

<sup>8</sup> Lam. ii. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Ps. cxxii. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp. 26. 29.

<sup>9</sup> Sermon, &c. *ibid.* p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Sermon, &c. *ibid.* p. 4. (John xviii. 36.)

<sup>4</sup> Pages 29. 38.

dare to appeal to the Universal Church<sup>5</sup>, in which, so many of her writers declare, lies the ultimate appeal<sup>6</sup>?"

Thus, and thus only, (say the members of the Church of Rome) can she have peace. And, viewed in its tendency to such a result, the late judicial decision is described as "an event calculated in a most important, and, to *them*, in a most *consoling* way, to affect the state of Religion in this country, and more particularly the position of that Establishment which, under the *name* of the Church of England, is most especially connected with the religious and spiritual destinies of the great mass of the people<sup>7</sup>;" and it is characterized as "a providential event, in which the wisdom of God has directed the course of things for the advancement of His holy religion, and for the triumph of His true Church<sup>8</sup>."

This, my brethren, is not my language; the sentiments it expresses are not imagined by me: it was uttered a short time since, by one of the chief Ministers of the Church of Rome, and has been printed and published to the world<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 29. Dr. Wiseman means thereby, the *particular* Church of Rome *as she now is*: to which, it is to be hoped, *none* of the writers of the Church of England declare lies the ultimate appeal. Would that the Church of Rome would consent to an appeal to Holy Scripture, as interpreted by the teaching and practice of the Universal Church!

<sup>6</sup> Page 29.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. pp. 3, 4.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 35.

<sup>9</sup> See "A Sermon preached in St. George's Catholic Church, Southwark, on Sunday, the 17th of March, 1850, by the Right Rev. N. WISEMAN, Bishop of Melipotamus, V.A.L. London: Thomas Richardson and Son," pp. 39; and entitled, "The Final Appeal in Matters of Faith."

The following are among the concluding words of this Sermon, which convey an important lesson to members of the Church of England, pp. 35, 36.

"It is impossible not to see, what a new element of dissolution has been hereby introduced (i. e. by this Judicial Sentence) into the English Church; how those errors which, till now, have been



This challenge—thus publicly given—contains several propositions, which may be thus stated :

1. An allegation that the Church of England is enthralled by the civil Power, and depends for her doctrine on its decrees ;

2. That she has no clear doctrine on a primary Article of the Faith ; and that she avows that she has none ;

3. That she is torn by divisions ;

4. On the ground of these allegations, she is urged to emancipate herself by an appeal to Rome : and her members are called upon to join the communion of the Church of Rome.

I. To the first of these charges an answer is supplied by the party who prefers it ;

He thus speaks<sup>1</sup>.

“There has been a fallacy most marked, in much of the reasoning which has been put forth upon this subject. It is said, that it (the late judicial sentence) is the opinion, after all,—that it is the judgment,—of Laymen. It is *not* so ; because it is the sentence of the Supreme Authority, to which, in the Church, has been awarded the power of deciding in matters of error, heresy, and

merely unrecognized differences of opinion, may take a systematized form. It is impossible not to see how the decision which has been come to on this matter, would be similarly pronounced upon other doctrines, were they to be brought into the same course of judgment. And one can hardly foresee the extent, to which this may increase that complete division that exists among, not merely the Members, but the Rulers of that Church, upon the other of its great admitted Sacraments, and upon the very vital question of Apostolic Succession and the divine rights, even in spirituals, of the Rulers of the Church. My brethren, when these great questions of principle may arise, as I before said, it is not what may actually happen, but it is what has virtually taken place, when the cause has been permitted, that we must attend to. It is not certain that a house will fall immediately, because it is undermined, but the fact of its being so, may prepare us for the fall at any moment.”

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. pp. 20, 21.

schism. It is the *Head of the Church*, its Chief Governor, that has pronounced the decision. The others have been but her counsellors to guide her judgment; and Her fiat has been spoken, under the sanction of the *supremacy* which the Church herself has acknowledged or bestowed upon her<sup>2</sup>."

Such is his language.

It being allowed, then, that this sentence is the voice of the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, let us consider what the nature of that Supremacy is, concerning which much misunderstanding seems to exist.

This question cannot be better decided, than by reference to the solemn Oath administered to the Sovereigns of England at their Coronation, in this sacred place.

"ARCHBISHOP.—Will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the Laws of God, the true Profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by Law? And will you *maintain and preserve inviolably* the *settlement* of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the *Doctrine, Worship, Discipline*, and *Government* thereof, as by law established within England and Ireland and the territories thereof?"

"QUEEN.—All this I promise to do<sup>3</sup>."

Hence it is clear, that the Sovereigns of England are solemnly pledged to uphold the *true* profession of the Gospel, and "to maintain and preserve inviolably" the *settled Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline* of the United Church; and, by consequence, the Sovereign, as its Supreme Governor, can have *no power*—and claims

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 27 of "The Form and Order of the Service, &c. &c. in the Coronation of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, on Thursday, the 28th June, 1838. London, Printed by George Eyre and Andrew Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, 1838."

none—to *alter* a single tittle or iota therein; and is precluded from doing so by the compact under which the Crown is held.

To cite the words of one of our greatest Divines<sup>4</sup>, “*Rex nihil potest, nisi quod jure potest*,” The Sovereign can do *nothing*, save what he can do by *law*. And in regard to *ecclesiastical* affairs, we willingly embrace that of Ambrose<sup>5</sup>, “*Imperator intra Ecclesiam, non supra Ecclesiam*,” Kings have dominion to exercise in Ecclesiastical affairs, but *according to the laws of the Church*. Whether it be, therefore, the nature of courts, or the kind of governors, or the order of proceeding in whatsoever spiritual businesses,—*for* (i. e. in defence of) the *received laws* and *liberty* of the Church, the King hath supreme authority and power, but *against* them *none*.”

If, therefore, any judgment of the Supreme Governor be *not according* to the laws of the Church, but at variance either with her *settled Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, or Government*, that judgment is no judgment of the Church; it is a judgment *in error*, and ought to be amended accordingly.

The question therefore arises—“*Is the recent Judgment according to the Worship and Doctrine, Discipline and Government of the Church?*” Can it be affirmed, consistently with an inviolable maintenance of that Worship and Doctrine, that the Church of England has *not* spoken plainly with regard to the effect of the Sacrament of Baptism, and that *she* allows two contrary opinions to be taught by her Ministers on this or any other great Christian Verity, and has thus failed in her duty as a *Pillar and Ground of the Truth*?

Assuredly not.

<sup>4</sup> HOOKER, Eccl. Pol. VII. ii. 13 and 17.

<sup>5</sup> Ep. 32. ii. 873.

But here the objector may except,—Who are private individuals, that they should contravene the judgment of Public Authority? The Church herself, by her highest Representative, *avows* that she has no definite doctrine on this subject. Therefore she cannot be supposed to have any.

To this we would say in reply: It is, indeed, a necessary duty for Christian men, and especially for Christian Ministers, to maintain the authority of the *Powers that be; for they are ordained of God*<sup>6</sup>. *Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers*<sup>7</sup>: and *Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey Magistrates*<sup>8</sup>.

But all Christian Men owe it to themselves and to God, to exercise their Reason, which is God's gift, and of which He will demand a strict account, how they have used it, at the last Day. *Ye are bought with a price*, says St. Paul, *therefore glorify God in your spirit which is God's; and be ye not the servants of men*<sup>9</sup>.

We owe it also to our Governors, not to sacrifice our liberty. They desire to be obeyed by freemen, and not by slaves. Our service to them is a reasonable service. If it were not, it would be of little worth. And they know that the Apostle says first, *Fear God*, and next, *Honour the King*<sup>1</sup>: and if God be not *first* feared, the King will *never* be honoured. We owe it, therefore, to God's Representatives and Vicegerents (which Magistrates are) to serve God, and *to stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made us free*<sup>2</sup>.

This liberty, doubtless, must be used with great

<sup>6</sup> Rom. xiii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Titus iii. 1.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 17.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 14.

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Gal. v. 1.

soberness; it must never be *made a cloak of maliciousness*<sup>3</sup>; it must never be abused into an occasion for disparagement of the persons, much less for disrespect to the office, of Governors. But it must never be surrendered and sacrificed; it must be exercised as a trust from God, and especially in *the things of God*. This is evident from our Lord's Precept to His disciples: *Call no man your father upon earth, for One is your Master, even Christ*<sup>4</sup>. And He exhorted them to pay deference in all lawful matters to the Scribes and Pharisees, *because they sate in Moses' seat*<sup>5</sup>; but He also enjoined them to *beware of the leaven, or false doctrine, of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy*<sup>6</sup>.

The question therefore must be asked,

Has it been *proved*—can it be proved—that the Church of England speaks *ambiguously* (for such is the allegation) concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, and that she *leaves it open* to her Ministers to teach *two opposite doctrines* on this subject?

The Church herself (as has been already shewn<sup>7</sup>) has answered this question in the negative: and no Representatives of the Church can have equal authority with the Church herself. If they are at variance with her, their judgment must yield to hers. It is clear, then, that all debate on the question of ambiguity is at an end.

This point, then, being settled, let us see what follows.

The Romish objector urges, that it is of little importance to *have* truth, if we have no *power to maintain* it: and if Law is on the side of error, then we are under civil bondage, and in secular trammels, and

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxiii. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xxiii. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xvi. 6. 11. Mark viii. 15. Luke xii. 1.

<sup>7</sup> See above, pp. 28, 29, and p. 47.

ought to emancipate ourselves from them, by reunion with the Church of Rome.

To this we answer, that we *have* power to maintain the truth. And, if we have truth, we have God with us. And, *if God be with us, who shall be against us*<sup>8</sup>? *If the Lord be on our side, we will not fear what man can do unto us*<sup>9</sup>. Here is the exercise of our trust in Him. Here is the trial of our Patience. And if we do not overstep the bounds of Christian charity, meekness, and moderation, we are sure that the Great Head of the Church will never desert us. Christ loves His Spouse when she is made like to Him by suffering. And He has taught us by His own example, in remaining in the communion of the Jewish Church, when Scribes and Pharisees taught in it, and when an Annas and a Caiaphas ministered at its altars, and when it was so tyrannized over by a civil and heathen Power, that even the High Priesthood was put up to auction and sold to the highest bidder<sup>1</sup>; and by worshipping in the Temple and teaching in the Synagogue, because of the Oracles of God and the Ordinances of God still remaining there, He has instructed us, that we ought never to allow ourselves to be irritated by the personal defects of Rulers in an Apostolic Church, in which the Canon of Scripture is preserved entire and pure, and the two Sacraments are fully administered (both of which things are true, in the case of the Church of

<sup>8</sup> Rom. viii. 31.

<sup>9</sup> Ps. cxviii. 6.

<sup>1</sup> The high priesthood was hereditary in the family of Aaron, (Numb. xvi. 40,) but there were about *thirteen* different High Priests in Our Lord's age; some not even of a Sacerdotal family; and made and unmade at pleasure by the heathen Power of Rome. Cp. Josephus Antiq. XV. ii. § 4. XV. iii. § 1. XX. viii. § 5. with Whiston's note, and XX. x. whence it appears that the High Priests from the time of Herod to the taking of Jerusalem were twenty-eight.

England, and neither of them<sup>2</sup> is true in that of the Church of Rome), to make a rent in the robe of Christ, and to fall into schism, which is a heinous sin.

II. The allegation with regard to *secular* bondage being thus disposed of, we proceed to consider further,

Whether the existence of *divisions* in the Church of England, or the *toleration* of error by its Representatives, affords any ground for separation from it and for submission to the Church of Rome.

We do not disguise or extenuate the evil of dissensions and errors: we deeply deplore them; we earnestly pray God to give us true repentance and fervent charity, and to bind us all together *in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. Behold how good and joyful a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in Unity*<sup>3</sup>.

But the question is, Do these evils justify separation from the Church of England and union with that of Rome?

To the Romanist objectors, who affirm that they not only justify, but require it, we would say, with all the earnestness which befits this solemn question, in which the future interests of immortal souls are involved, let not our appeal be to *man*, but to GOD. Let us quit the strifes of our own age and country, and let us resort to the Apostolic times, and to the quiet retirement of the isle of Patmos, and to the blessed society of the beloved disciple ST. JOHN, and let us hear from his lips what the SPIRIT saith unto the Churches.

You, as well as we (we say to the Church of Rome) receive the Apocalypse as the work of St. John<sup>4</sup>, and

<sup>2</sup> See the proofs of this, in the Author's Lectures on the Canon of Scripture. Lect. ii. iii. iv.

<sup>3</sup> Eph. iv. 1—3. Ps. cxxxiii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> The Church of Rome, at the Council of Trent, Sess. iv. (April 8, 1546), declared "the Apocalypse of the Apostle St. John" to

as written by the Holy Ghost; we are therefore both agreed, that its words are the words of the Evangelist, and were dictated by the Spirit of God.

This Book opens with a vision, which is called a MYSTERY. St. John sees seven golden Candlesticks, and Christ walking in the midst of them, and in His Hand are seven stars. And St. John is ordered by Christ to write what he *sees, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter, the Mystery of the Seven Stars which thou sawest in My Right Hand, and the seven golden Candlesticks. The Seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches; and the seven Candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven Churches*<sup>5</sup>.

The word MYSTERY, as employed in the New Testament, where it is used above twenty times, describes something of a *spiritual*<sup>6</sup> character. And the *first* Mystery, with which the Apocalypse opens, represents the seven *Churches* of Asia, which, as displayed in the Apocalypse, have not only a literal and historical reality, but have ever been regarded as typifying *all*<sup>7</sup> the particular Churches, of which the Universal Church of Christ, in every age and country, is composed.

Thus the first Mystery represents the *whole* Church formed of *particular* Churches.

St. John is commanded by Christ to write to the *Angel* of each of these Seven Churches. The word *Angel*, which signifies ambassador or messenger, means the Bishop, that is, Christ's *Embassador*, who delivers the *message* of His Gospel to the People. Seven letters are accordingly written to the Seven Churches.

be Canonical Scripture, and anathematized all who do not receive it as such.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. i. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Hence it is rendered "Sacramentum" (Rev. i. 19) in the Vulgate.

<sup>7</sup> This is the unanimous interpretation of ancient Expositors; and is also adopted by Roman Interpreters. See Cornel. a Lapide ad Apoc. i. 13. "Septem, i. e. *Omni*bus Ecclesiis et Episcopis."



Scarcely any one of these particular Churches is represented in these Epistles as exempt from error in Doctrine, Discipline, and Manners. Some of them are deeply infected with religious corruptions. Ephesus has *left its first love*<sup>8</sup>. In Pergamus are some who hold *the doctrine of Balaam*<sup>9</sup>. The Angel, or chief representative, of the Church of Thyatira, suffers *a Jezebel to teach*<sup>1</sup>. Sardis has a *name to live, and is dead*<sup>2</sup>. Laodicea is *neither hot nor cold, and is miserable, poor, blind, and naked*<sup>3</sup>.

On account of all these errors, the Angels, or Chief Ministers, of the Churches, are reprov'd, and are commanded to repent<sup>4</sup>. But Church Unity is not broken. The members of the Church of Sardis and of Thyatira are not commanded to *quit* those Churches, and to repair to the Church of *Rome* for sound Doctrine and spiritual unity. But they are all regarded by the Holy Spirit as subject to their respective Angels or Chief Pastors. And the unsound Churches are in communion with the more sound, and all are in communion with St. John, and, through him, with the Holy Spirit and with Christ.

These Churches enjoyed the spiritual privileges which constitute the essence of a Church. They had the true Canon of Scripture as delivered to them by St. John. They had the Sacraments of Christ dispensed by an Apostolic Ministry; and though errors in Doctrine were propagated by some of their Clergy, yet those errors were *not imposed* as terms of communion. And since nothing *can* justify separation from an Apostolic Church, *except the imposition of sinful terms of Communion by that Church*<sup>5</sup>, therefore their members re-

<sup>8</sup> Rev. ii. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. ii. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. ii. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. iii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. iii. 15. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. ii. 5. 16; iii. 3. 19.

<sup>5</sup> See above, Sermon II. p. 36.

mained in communion with their Bishops and each other; and St. John communicated with them all.

The Holy Spirit of God, in this first MYSTERY of the Apocalypse, *decides* the question between ourselves on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other.

We of the Church of England possess the pure and entire word of God. We have in our hands the Canon of Holy Scripture, sealed by the Apostle and Evangelist St. John. We have the Two Sacraments of Christ, dispensed by an Apostolic Ministry. We have also a Liturgy, such as the Churches of Asia would have loved to use; one derived from Scripture and the Ritual of the primitive Church<sup>6</sup>. Great may be the failings of Ministers and Governors of our Church, either by lack of Discipline, or by sufferance, encouragement or propagation, of erroneous Doctrine; and it is deeply to be deplored that the Church should be thus misrepresented by any of her Members; and it may be truly said, that "the Teacher's error is the People's trial"; but, although we see here much to weep over as the consequence of our own sins, and of the Tempter's power, and of God's just wrath against us, yet we perceive no reason for murmuring against Him, as if we of the Church of England deserved more at His hands than the Churches of St. John. And deeply should we rue it, both in this world and the next, if the *personal defects* of *men* were to drive us in a fit of impatience to offend God, and rend His Church, and to sin against Christ.

III. Let us now turn from defence of ourselves, and consider the case of the Church of Rome.

She calls *herself* the Tribunal of "Final Appeal in Matters of Faith:" she invites us all to union with her.

<sup>6</sup> See above, Sermon VI. pp. 136. 152, 153.

<sup>7</sup> Hooker, v. lxii. 9.

We have been contemplating the *first* MYSTERY of the Apocalypse, in which the Spirit of Peace, speaking by the Apostle of Love, teaches us a lesson of forbearance, patience, and charity, and warns us against separation from the Church.

But there is a *second* MYSTERY, pourtrayed in the Book of Revelation; and we now direct our eyes to *that*.

*I saw a Woman, says St. John, sit upon a scarlet coloured Beast, full of names of Blasphemy, and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, Babylon the Great*<sup>8</sup>. *And the Angel said unto me, I will tell thee the MYSTERY of the Woman*<sup>9</sup>.

What does this Mystery mean?

Certain characteristics are specified by the Holy Spirit, by which this question is to be answered. Hear, then, what the Spirit says,

1. *The Woman which thou sawest is that Great City which reigneth over the Kings of the Earth*<sup>1</sup>.

What City is this?

In St. John's age there was one great City, one City greater than all, one which reigned over the Kings of the Earth;

That City was *Rome*.

2. What next does the Spirit say?

*The Seven Heads of the Beast are seven Mountains, on which the Woman sitteth*<sup>2</sup>.

There was one great City—and one only—which in St. John's age reigned over the Kings of the Earth, and which was built upon Seven Hills;

That City was *Rome*.

3. What next does the Spirit say?

*Upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great*<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> Rev. xvii. 3. 5.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. xvii. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xvii. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xvii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. xvii. 5.

The literal Babylon had been long destroyed. But there was one City in the world which, for many reasons, natural, moral, and historical, was commonly called Babylon both by Jews and Christians of St. John's age, and for many successive generations<sup>4</sup>;

And that City was *Rome*.

4. This evidence of identity is so irresistible, that the most learned members of the Church of Rome have publicly acknowledged, that the Great City, the City on Seven Hills, the City which reigned over the Kings of the earth, the Babylon of the Apocalypse, is the City of Rome.

Let me specify three of these;

(1.) One of her most eminent Church Historians, Cardinal Baronius, thus writes: "It is confessed that Rome is signified in the Apocalypse of St. John under the name of Babylon<sup>5</sup>."

(2.) One of her most eminent Controversialists, Cardinal Bellarmine, thus speaks: "St. John in the Apocalypse calls Rome Babylon; as is clearly evident from the seventeenth chapter, where Babylon the Great is said to sit on seven mountains, and to reign over the kings of the earth. For there is no city, but Rome, which in St. John's age reigned over the kings of the earth; and it is well known that Rome was built upon Seven hills<sup>6</sup>."

(3.) One of her most celebrated Preachers, Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, thus speaks: "It is the unanimous tradition of all the Fathers of the Church, that the Babylon of the Apocalypse is ancient Rome. All the

<sup>4</sup> See the proofs of this, ancient and modern, given at full length in the Author's Lectures on the Apocalypse, Lect. xi. pp. 338—348, 2nd ed. 1849.

<sup>5</sup> Card. Baronii Annales Eccles. ad A.D. 45. num. xvi.

<sup>6</sup> Card. Bellar. de Summo Pontifice, cap. ii. Lib. ii. § Præterea, &c.

Fathers agree in this. And the features of the Apocalyptic Babylon are so marked, that it is an easy matter there to recognize Rome<sup>7</sup>."

We may, therefore, now say to the Church of Rome: Reason shews, and your Divines confess, that Babylon in the Apocalypse is Rome.

5. But here she may say: True, *Babylon is Rome*, it is the *city* of Rome, but it is *not* the *Church* of Rome: Babylon is the city of Rome while it remained under *heathen* rule, but it is not the city of Rome passing under the sway of the Roman Pontiffs: it is not the city of Rome as it was in the middle ages, and as it is at this day<sup>8</sup>.

Such is her argument.

6. To this we reply: Babylon in the Apocalypse is Rome; and the prophecies concerning Babylon in the Apocalypse, refer to Rome as she has long been and as she now is. This we prove as follows:

Look at the Apocalypse itself. The *prophecy* thus speaks: *Babylon is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit*<sup>9</sup>. *She saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow; therefore shall Her Plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burnt with fire*<sup>1</sup>. *And a mighty Angel took up a stone like a great milstone, and cast it*

<sup>7</sup> Bossuet, Pref. sur l'Apocalypse, § vii.

<sup>8</sup> "Non Romana *Ecclesia* est Babylonis nomine nuncupata, sed ipsa tantum modo civitas, cum adversus *Ecclesiam* bellum gereret." Baron. Ann. A.D. 45. s. num. xviii.

"Non contra *Ecclesiam* Romanam sed contra Gentilitatem Romanam Joannes est locutus." Bellarm. de Pontif. ii. c. ii.

"La Babylone, dont saint Jean prédit la chute, étoit Rome conquérante et son empire: et la chute de Rome arrivée sous Alarie est un dénouement de la prophétie de saint Jean." Bossuet, Pref. sur l'Apoc. § viii. § x.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. xviii. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xviii. 7, 8.

*into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all: and the voice of harpers and musicians shall be heard no more at all in thee, and the light of a candle shall shine no more in thee*<sup>2</sup>. Besides this: the agents of her destruction are described; the Ten horns (or ten kingdoms), which *receive power together with the Beast*, on which the City is enthroned<sup>3</sup>, *these shall hate her and make her desolate, and burn her with fire.*

Such are the words of the Holy Spirit in the Apocalypse, concerning the fate of the City of Rome. Now, let me ask, Has not the *City* of Rome long *ceased* to be *heathen*? has it not been now for many centuries under the sway of the Roman Pontiffs; in a word, has not the *City* of Rome been long *identified* with the *Church* of Rome? And can it be said, that these prophecies were *fulfilled*, while Rome was *heathen*? Have they been fulfilled yet? No. Rome herself must *deny* that they have. You (we say to her) can never allow, that, when you *ceased* to be *heathen*, and when you passed under the sway of the *Bishops* of *Rome*, you *became the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit*. No: you say that you then became the Holy City, the Christian Sion. And no one will assert that Powers, once leagued with Rome, have as yet risen up against her, and made her desolate, and burnt her with fire. No one, who will exercise his reason, and is not blinded by prejudice, will affirm, that the City of Rome has been utterly burnt with fire; and that the voice of music has utterly ceased in her, and that she has been cast like a great milstone into the sea, never more to rise.

You acknowledge Babylon to be the city of Rome; you receive the Apocalypse as the work of St. John,

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xviii. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. xvii. 12. 16.

and as inspired by God; you believe therefore that its predictions are true, and cannot fail of their effect. And now let us solemnly enquire,—Can you, in the presence of God, say, that the fulfilment of these prophecies is *past*, and that they only concerned the City of Rome while yet heathen, and had no reference to it passing from heathen rule, and coming under the sway of the Bishop of Rome, and such as it has been for many centuries, and such as it is now? Can you answer this question in the affirmative? Do your divines agree in so answering it? No, you well know, they do not.

7. The question perplexes them: it agitates, it divides, it distracts them. Some of them (as I have said, and they very eminent) assert that *all* these prophecies concerning Babylon *have been* fulfilled in heathen Rome—an opinion which has now been refuted. Others of them, scarcely less distinguished, overwhelmed by the force of the evidence, which has just been recited against that opinion, run into the other extreme, and take refuge in the darkness of futurity, and deny that *any* part of these prophecies has yet been accomplished.

Thus some of your Divines say, that these prophecies concern the *past*; some affirm that they concern the *future*.

It is very strange that you, who boast Unity and Infallibility, as belonging to *you alone*, should not *agree* in the Interpretation of those Scripture prophecies, which, you all allow, concern your own City.

But not to dwell now on that; we proceed to observe, that these last mentioned Roman divines say, that Rome will again become heathen, and that *then* she will be destroyed, and that so these prophecies will be fulfilled<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> One of the most distinguished of this class, Cornelius a Lapide, thus writes: "These prophecies cannot be applied to the calamities

8. This other opinion, then, must now be considered:—

Let us, therefore, again refer to the Apocalypse. There it is said that the Beast on which the woman sitteth, is the *eighth* head or king<sup>5</sup>; and that *five* heads had already fallen in St. John's age, that the sixth was then in being, that the seventh would continue only for a short time, and then the eighth would appear; and that the eighth is the Beast on which the Woman sits.

What can be more clear than this?

If Kings are here used to signify individuals, then the eighth head, i. e. the Beast and the Woman on it, must have arisen very soon after St. John's age. But we allow, that kings are here used for *forms of government*, as is common in Scripture Prophecy<sup>6</sup>. The eight heads are the eight successive forms of Government in the City of Rome. Five of these had followed one another, and had passed away, in St. John's age. Therefore five heads are said to have *fallen*. The sixth or imperial head was then in being. But the imperial head also fell. It perished with Romulus Augustulus, A.D. 476. It was to be followed by the seventh. And the seventh was to be only of brief duration, it was to *continue for a short space*<sup>7</sup>. The eighth was to arise

which Rome received from Alaric, Genseric, Odoacer, and Totila: for those calamities were not inflicted by ten kings, nor were they so great as the destruction which is predicted in the Apocalypse, and which is *final*." "Babylon in the Apocalypse is Rome, not Rome Christian, but infidel and heathen, such as it was in the age of St. John, and such as it *will be again hereafter*." (Corn. a Lapide in Apoc. xvii.) And again, "These prophecies concern Rome, not such as she was or is, but such as she *will be at the end of the world*."

<sup>5</sup> Rev. xvii. 10, 11.

<sup>6</sup> Daniel vii. 17. 23, 24. See the LXX Version.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. xvii. 10.



from the seventh<sup>8</sup>; that is, without interruption, after the seventh; and the eighth is *the Beast on which the Woman sitteth*<sup>9</sup>.

Therefore the Woman, described in the Apocalypse, must have appeared long ago.

These Prophecies concern that Woman: this Woman is the city Rome: and they therefore concern Rome, not *future*, but such as she has long been.

Rome, as a City, passed by degrees under the temporal sway of the Bishops of Rome; and was entirely under their rule in the eleventh century; and so it remains to this day: the Roman Pontiff is the Roman Sovereign; he wears both the Episcopal Mitre, and the Imperial Tiara. The Roman coin bears the Papal arms. In a word, the *City* has long been *identified* with the *Church*; and, therefore, the prophecies which concern the *City* of Rome, concern also the *Church* of Rome.

9. Indeed we proceed to assert, that they are directed against the *City*, not so much in its *civil* character as its *ecclesiastical*; they concern it as a *City*, but they much more concern it *as a Church*, and as the head of a *spiritual* Empire.

10. We shew this as follows:—The “Great City” is described in the Apocalypse as bearing on her head the name MYSTERY. This word indicates her to be something *Spiritual*. The *first* Mystery of the Apocalypse displayed to us the Universal *Church*, in its sevenfold fulness, or, in other words, it exhibited the Universal Church consisting of particular Churches. The *second* Mystery represents a particular Church claiming to be the Universal Church. Hence we thus read: the Woman sitteth *upon many waters . . . which are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά, xvii. 11.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. xvii. 11. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xvii. 1. 15.

11. What also is the city called? a Harlot<sup>2</sup>. A *true* Church is called the *Spouse* of Christ<sup>3</sup>. Hence a *faithless* Church is called a *Harlot*. Hence the Prophet says of the Jewish Church, *How is the faithful City become a Harlot*<sup>4</sup>! and, therefore, in the Apocalypse, false *doctrine* is termed *fornication*<sup>5</sup>. Here, again, we see that these prophecies, which concern the *City* of Rome, and describe it as a Harlot, are directed against that city as a *Church*.

12. And how is this Harlot portrayed? As holding, a golden cup in her hand, *full of abominations, and making the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornications*<sup>6</sup>. And again: *Babylon is fallen, that Great City, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication*<sup>7</sup>. And violence, we read, is used to *compel* all men to receive *on their right hand, or on their foreheads, the Mark of the Beast on which she sits*<sup>8</sup>.

Hence we perceive, that the Harlot City not only represents a faithless Church claiming to be the universal Church; but it also describes a Church *imposing* her errors on all as *terms of communion*; giving the poisoned cup to all, and, as far as in her lies, *requiring* all to drink thereof.

This rivets more strongly these prophecies: it fixes them still more closely on the Church of Rome. *She* is not content with *teaching* erroneous doctrines, contrary to Scripture, and to the faith of the primitive Church; but she *imposes* them as *terms of communion*, and as necessary to everlasting salvation.

In her Trent-Creed<sup>9</sup> or Oath, imposed on all her

<sup>2</sup> Rev. xvii. 1. 5. 15, 16. and xix. 2.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Is. i. 21.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. ii. 20. 24.

<sup>6</sup> Rev. xvii. 2. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. xiv. 8. and xviii. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Rev. xiii. 15—17.

<sup>9</sup> Forma Juramenti Professionis Fidei. See Streitwolf Libri Symbol. Eccl. Cath. Rom. p. xlvii. p. 98.

Clergy, and which she requires, in her Pontifical, to be taken implicitly by all who fall away<sup>1</sup> to her from the Church of England, she propounds the following tenets, That Rome is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; That there are Seven Sacraments, neither more nor less; That the Sacramental Elements are transubstantiated into the real corporeal Flesh and Blood of Christ; That Saints, Angels, and the Virgin Mary are to be worshipped; That there is a Purgatory; That the Whole Body and Blood of Christ is received in the Bread alone, without the Cup; That all the decrees of Trent are religiously to be kept; in one<sup>2</sup> of which all men are anathematized who do not receive as *inspired* the Apocryphal Books, *not one* of which Christ Himself and His Apostles ever received as inspired: and thus she utters impiety against Christ, and requires all others to do so. This she affirms to be “the true Catholic Faith, out of which there is no salvation;” and she anathematizes, and calls upon all others to anathematize, every one who does not receive and maintain these Errors of Doctrine.

This Creed is the Cup which she holds in her hand; and, as far as she is able, she makes all nations of the world to drink it.

And now, what is she doing at this hour? She is presenting herself before us as the Universal Court of “Final Appeal in matters of Faith.” We must all drink of her cup,—or we have no faith. Thus, unwill-

<sup>1</sup> See Pontifical. Roman. Ordo ad Reconciliandum Apostatam Schismaticum vel Hæreticum, p. 454. ed. Rom. 1818. “I profess that I hold that Faith which the Holy Roman Church delivers . . . and I pronounce that all who contravene that Faith,—they and all their doctrines and followers,—deserve an everlasting Anathema.”

<sup>2</sup> Sessio iv. Conc. Trid. p. 13. ed. Streitwolf, 1838.

lingly and unwittingly, she is fulfilling these prophecies, which predict her doom.

Let us now enquire, what does the Spirit next say of her by the mouth of St. John.

*I heard a voice from heaven saying, Come out of her, My People, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. And her plagues shall come in one day, Death, and Mourning, and Famine; and she shall be utterly burnt with fire: for strong is the Lord God Who judgeth her<sup>3</sup>. In one hour she is made desolate. Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy Apostles and Prophets! for God hath avenged you of her<sup>4</sup>.*

How wonderful is this! That the Apostle of Love should be commanded by the Spirit of Peace to utter such words as these! He, who in his Epistles to the Seven Churches appeared to be so mild and tolerant; he who rebuked the Angels of those Churches for their errors, but remained in communion with them, and never called upon any to separate from them; how is it that *he* should now say, *Come out of her, my People, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues?*

Striking, indeed, is the contrast; but the reason of it is clear.

The Angels of the Seven Churches were not exempt from error, and some of them connived at errors in others, and for this they are sharply rebuked; but they did *not impose* these errors on others as *terms of communion*, and their Churches had the pure Word of God and the Sacraments of Christ, and therefore St. John communicated with them.

But the case of the Harlot Church, as described by St. John, is widely different from theirs. She is

<sup>3</sup> Rev. xviii. 4. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. xviii. 20.

not content with *drinking* of her cup herself, but *makes all to drink of it*<sup>5</sup>; she *imposes heresy* on all, and so *necessitates schism*. Thus the schism and the heresy are both from her. And *therefore* the voice from heaven says, *Come out of her, My People, that ye be not partakers of her sins*; for, if you remain in her, you *must* partake in her sins; therefore *come out of her, that ye receive not of her plagues*.

To sum up what has now been said.

We have been contemplating the TWO MYSTERIES of the Apocalypse. The word *Mystery* signifies something spiritual; it here describes a Church. The first Mystery is explained to us by Christ Himself. *The Mystery of the Seven Stars which thou sawest . . . The Seven Stars are the Angels of the Seven Churches, and the Seven Candlesticks which thou sawest are the Seven Churches*<sup>6</sup>.

The second Mystery is explained also. *I will tell thee the Mystery of the Woman*. The Beast that carrieth her, which hath the Seven Heads, is described, and *The Seven Heads are expounded to be Seven Mountains on which the Woman sitteth*<sup>7</sup>.

The first Mystery is the Mystery of the Seven Stars.

The second Mystery is the Mystery of the Seven Hills.

The first Mystery represents the Universal Church in its sevenfold fulness, containing within it all particular Churches.

The second Mystery represents a particular Church, the Church on Seven Hills, the Church of Rome, claiming to be the Church Universal.

<sup>5</sup> See the words quoted above, p. 212, from Rev. xvii. 2. 5. xviii. 3. xiv. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Rev. i. 20.

<sup>7</sup> Rev. xvii. 7. 9.

The first Mystery represents the Universal Church, liable to defects, but not imposing errors as terms of communion; and therefore, by virtue of the Word and the Sacraments, held together in Apostolic Communion with St. John and with Christ, Who *walketh in the midst of it*, and governed by an Apostolic Ministry, shining like a glorious constellation in the Hand of Christ.

The second Mystery represents the particular Church of Rome, holding the cup of her false doctrines in her hand, and making all nations to drink thereof. And the voice from heaven cries, *Come out of her, My People*, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

The first Mystery is a Mystery of Godliness.

The second is a Mystery of Iniquity.

Such is the interpretation of the two Mysteries of the Apocalypse.

If any Minister or Member of the Church of Rome can disprove this conclusion, he is hereby invited to do so. If he can, doubtless he will; and if none attempt it, it may be presumed that they cannot; and if they cannot, then, as they love their salvation, they ought to embrace the truth, which is preached to them by the mouth of St. John, and by the voice of CHRIST.

This subject suggests the most solemn admonitions to two parties. Let both *hear, what the Spirit saith unto the Churches*.

1. To those among ourselves, who are disturbed by present events in the Church of England, and imagine that it is no sin to separate from her, and who may feel tempted to fall away to the Church of Rome—

The first Mystery teaches, that Schism is a great offence against God. Nothing can justify it. If any

Ministers of the Church of England teach what is false in defiance of the plain letter of her Liturgy, to which they have signified "their unfeigned assent and consent" in the House of God, great indeed is their sin; but it affords no pretext for separation from the Church, or excuse for that separation. The defects of the Ministers and Angels in the Apocalyptic Churches supplied no cause, occasion, or apology for separation from those Churches. Separation from them would have been separation from St. John and from Christ. And so we say now, separation from the Church of Christ in this land is separation from Him Whose Word it has, Whose Sacraments it ministers, and Whose Church it is. And *separation* from the Church of *England* to *join* the Church of *Rome* is separation from a Church which is not exempt from liability to err, but which does not err in imposing any error upon any man, and is faithful and true in dispensing to all her People the Faith pure and entire in the Word of God and in her Book of Common Prayer, and administration of Sacraments, which are her only terms of communion; and it is union to a Church which not only teaches error by her Ministers, but imposes on her members *sinful terms of communion*, in her public acts and worship, and in her solemn formularies of faith.

Here, then, let us turn to the Second Mystery and say, to those who feel tempted to fall away to Rome, God has given *you* a special warning by the mouth of St. John. Can you deny the truth of what has been said? Have you any *other* interpretation of these divine Prophecies? Have you duly reflected upon them? Strange to say, some cast aside the counsels of the Comforter in the Book of Revelation. They will not hear what the Spirit there saith unto the Churches. They appear almost to forget its existence. Some

have been betrayed by the Evil One into dismissing its awful warnings with an idle jest or flippant sneer. Most miserable mockery! Thus Satan cheats them of the truth, and robs them of the gift of God. But be not you so deluded. Look carefully at the evidence of the case. This Mystery was revealed by the Spirit of Peace to the Apostle of Love. Awful indeed it is, but be assured it was intended as a warning in mercy; and if you neglect it, you frustrate His love towards you. If you blame or disparage it, you are not censuring man, but are uttering evil words against the Holy Ghost; you are incurring the curse pronounced against those who *take away from the words of the book of this prophecy*<sup>8</sup>; and you are forfeiting the blessing promised to all who profit by its warnings, *Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein*<sup>9</sup>.

Therefore, ask yourself this question, When the voice from heaven cries, concerning the Church of Rome, *Come out of her My People, can I dare to enter in, and dwell there?*

Our last appeal is to the *Church of Rome*.

You receive the Apocalypse as the work of St. John inspired by the Holy Ghost. Here we agree. How, then, can you rejoice because some of us fall into error? Did the Church of Ephesus triumph, because in the Church of Thyatira a Jezebel was *suffered to teach*? Did the Church of Philadelphia exult, because the works of the Church of Sardis *were not perfect before God*? And, in vaunting yourself, may not you haply at this hour be fulfilling the prophetic description of the Apocalypse, *She saith in her heart, I sit a Queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow*. And what

<sup>8</sup> Rev. xxii. 19.

<sup>9</sup> Rev. i. 3.



follows? *Therefore, shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine*<sup>1</sup>. We hear mourning in your laughter. There is a voice of lamentation and woe in your triumphal shouts. God forbid that we should rejoice therein. We weep over you. You have called upon us to resort to you as the final Court of Appeal. But we call you to the only true final Court of Appeal, the heavenly Court of Appeal, the Tribunal of God. Hear what the SPIRIT *saith unto the Churches*. You call on us to join you. We, no, *not* we, but the Holy Ghost calls on your members to come out of you. We believe, and here, in the face of God, we solemnly declare our belief, that the prophecies of the Holy Spirit uttered by St. John point at you. We believe, and here we proclaim our belief, that the Apostle St. John,—by protesting in the Apocalypse against your grievous abominations, in which, by adoring the Blessed Virgin as Queen of Heaven, and as exempt from all taint of original sin, you make her, the creature, a rival of the Creator, and force the human mother to be an instrument for dishonouring her Divine Son,—performs the office assigned to him by Christ on the cross; and that he, the beloved Disciple, thus *protects* the mother of his Lord, that he takes her, as it were, *to his own home*<sup>2</sup>, and thus shelters her from the outrage of your worship. We believe that the Holy Spirit warns you by his lips of the deadly consequences of these abominations. We therefore implore all your members to meditate upon these prophecies, while they are able. We say to them, Close not your eyes to the light from heaven; shut not your ears to the voice of God. Be wise in time. Deliver your souls. *Keep yourselves from Idols*<sup>3</sup>. Into the *Heavenly City nothing shall enter that worketh abomination or maketh a lie*<sup>4</sup>. *We*

<sup>1</sup> Rev. xviii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> John xix. 27.

<sup>3</sup> 1 John v. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Rev. xxi. 27.

*shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. I saw the dead small and great stand before God: and they were judged according to their works*<sup>5</sup>. We shall then have to render an account, how we have profited by the words which the *Spirit saith unto the Churches. Behold*, says Christ, *I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book*<sup>6</sup>. *I, Jesus, have sent Mine Angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches*<sup>7</sup>. *And behold I come quickly, and My reward is with Me*<sup>8</sup>. *Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus*<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Rev. xx. 12.<sup>6</sup> Rev. xxii. 7.<sup>7</sup> Rev. xxii. 16.<sup>8</sup> Rev. xxii. 12.<sup>9</sup> Rev. xxii. 20.

THE END.

## WORKS BY CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D.

Recently published, price 14s.

The Second Edition of **LECTURES** on the **APOCALYPSE**. Preached before the University of Cambridge. By **CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D.**, Canon of Westminster, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Public Orator and Hulsean Lecturer in the University.

On **ST. PAUL'S PROPHECY** concerning the **MAN of SIN**. Being supplementary to the *First* Edition of the above. 1s. 6d.

Also, by the same,

On the **CANON** of the **SCRIPTURES** of the **OLD** and **NEW TESTAMENT**, and on the **APOCRYPHA**; or, **Evidences of SCRIPTURE INSPIRATION**. Eleven Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge; being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1847. With a copious Appendix of ancient authorities. 10s. 6d.

**THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS**; or, Instruction for the Young Student concerning the Church and the Anglican Branch of it. Fifth Edition. 8s. 6d.

The **SAME**, in **MODERN GREEK**. 6s. 6d.

**ELEMENTS** of **INSTRUCTION** concerning the **CHURCH**, and the Anglican Branch of it; for the Use of Young Persons. 3s. 6d.

**LETTERS** to **M. GONDON**, Author of "*Mouvement Religieux en Angleterre*," "*Conversion de Cent Cinquante Ministres Anglicans*," &c., on the Destructive Character of the Church of Rome, both in Religion and Polity. Third Edition. 8s. 6d.

A **SEQUEL** to the above **LETTERS**. Second Edition. 7s. 6d.

A **DIARY** in **FRANCE**; mainly on Topics concerning Education and the Church. Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

The **SAME**, in **FRENCH**. 6s. 6d.

The **APOCALYPSE**; or, Book of Revelation. The original Greek Text, with MSS. Collations and Fac-Similes of Ancient MSS.; an English Translation and Harmony, with Notes; and an Appendix to the Hulsean Lectures for 1848 on the Apocalypse. 12s.

**THEOCRITUS**, Codicum MSS. ope recensitus et emendatus, cum Indicibus locupletissimis. 13s. 6d.

**ATHENS** and **ATTICA**. Journal of a Residence there; with Maps, Plans, and Inscriptions. Second Edition. 12s.

**GREECE**, Historical, Pictorial, and Descriptive. A New Edition. 1l. 11s. 6d.

**INEDITED ANCIENT WRITINGS**, copied from the Walls of the City of Pompeii, with Fac-similes. 2s. 6d.

**LATINÆ GRAMMATICÆ RUDIMENTA**; or, King Edward the Sixth's Grammar. In usum Scholarum. Editio Sexta. 3s. 6d.

**CORRESPONDENCE** of **RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.**, Master of Trinity College. Two vols. 2l. 2s.

**RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH a NATION**. A Sermon preached at Westminster Abbey, 1847. Published by request. Second Edition.

**NATIONAL WARNINGS** on **NATIONAL EDUCATION**. A Sermon. 1849. Third Edition.

RIVINGTONS,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

## BOOKS LATELY PUBLISHED.

- A SAFE PATH** for **HUMBLE CHURCHMEN**; in **SIX SERMONS** on the **CHURCH CATECHISM**, adapted to the Complexion of the Times. By **JOHN MILLER**, M.A. of Worcester College, Oxford. In 8vo. 4s. 6d.
- SERMONS.** By the Rev. **FRANCIS B. WOODWARD**, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen's, Dublin. In 12mo. 7s. 6d.
- ERUVIN**; or **MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS** on Subjects connected with the **NATURE, HISTORY, and DESTINY of MAN.** By the Rev. **S. R. MAITLAND**, D.D., F.R.S. and F.S.A. Second Edition. In small 8vo. 5s. 6d.
- LETTERS** in Vindication of the **CHURCH of IRELAND**; addressed to an English Member of Parliament. By the Rev. **JOHN M. MAGUIRE**, B.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin; Vicar of Boyle, in the Diocese of Elphin. In small 8vo. 6s.
- A GENERAL VIEW of the DOCTRINE of REGENERATION** in **BAPTISM.** By **CHRISTOPHER BETHELL**, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bangor. Fifth Edition. In 8vo. 9s.
- SCRIPTURAL COMMUNION with GOD**; or, the **PENTATEUCH**, and the **BOOK of JOB**; arranged in **HISTORICAL and CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER**; and newly divided into Sections for daily reading; with **INTRODUCTIONS, and PRAYERS**; and **NOTES** for the Student and Inquirer. By the Rev. **GEORGE TOWNSEND**, D.D., Canon of Durham. Complete in 2 vols. 8vo. 2l. 5s.
- PAROCHIAL SKETCHES.** In Verse. By the Rev. **ROBERT WILSON EVANS**, B.D. Vicar of Heversham, Author of "The Rectory of Valehead," and "The Bishopric of Souls." With Woodcuts. In small 8vo. 6s.
- HOLY THOUGHTS**; a **TREASURY of TRUE RICHES**, collected chiefly from our Old Writers. Fifth Edition. In pocket size. 1s. 6d.
- The **GOSPEL NARRATIVE of the PASSION of OUR LORD HARMONIZED, with REFLECTIONS.** By the Rev. **ISAAC WILLIAMS**, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. Fourth Edition. In small 8vo. 8s.
- Lately published, the other Volumes, viz. :
1. The **INTRODUCTION**, containing **THOUGHTS** on the **STUDY of the GOSPELS.** 8s.—2. The **NATIVITY.** 8s. 6d.—3. The **MINISTRY (Second Year).** 8s.—4. The **MINISTRY (Third Year).** 8s. 6d.—5. The **HOLY WEEK.** 8s. 6d.—6. The **RESURRECTION.** 8s.
- A Collected Edition of the SACRED ALLEGORIES** of the late Rev. **WILLIAM ADAMS**, M.A. With Memoir and Portrait of the Author. Elegantly printed in one Volume, post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- MEDITATIONS** from the **FATHERS of the FIRST FIVE CENTURIES**, arranged as Devotional Exercises on the **BOOK of COMMON PRAYER.** Intended to promote Soundness in the Faith, and Holiness of Life. By the Rev. **J. ENDELL TYLER**, B.D., Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. In 2 vols. small 8vo. 16s.
- GROTIUS de VERITATE RELIGIONIS CHRISTIANÆ.** A New Edition, with **ENGLISH NOTES and Illustrations.** For the Use of Students. By the Rev. **J. E. MIDDLETON**, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Lecturer on Theology at St. Bees' College. In 12mo. 6s.

RIVINGTONS,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

MAY, 1850.

# NEW BOOKS

IN THE COURSE OF PUBLICATION

BY

MESSRS. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

I.

ERUVIN; or MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS on Subjects connected with the NATURE, HISTORY, and DESTINY of MAN. By the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., F.R.S. and F.S.A. *Second Edition.* In small 8vo. 5s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

II.

SICKNESS; its TRIALS and BLESSINGS. In small 8vo. (*Just ready.*)

III.

A NEW HARMONY of the FOUR GOSPELS, in Parallel Columns, in the words of the Authorized Version. By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. In small 8vo. (*In the press.*)

This Work will form a Companion or Key to the COMMENTARY and HARMONY on the GOSPELS, by the SAME AUTHOR, in Six Volumes, just completed.

IV.

ENGLISH BALLADS, and other POEMS. By Lord JOHN MANNERS. In small 8vo. 4s. (*Just published.*)

V.

A SAFE PATH for HUMBLE CHURCHMEN; in SIX SERMONS on the CHURCH CATECHISM, adapted to the Complexion of the Times. By JOHN MILLER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. In 8vo. 4s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

VI.

The THEORY of BAPTISM. By the Rev. GEORGE CROLY, LL.D., Rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook. In 8vo. (*In the press.*)

VII.

SERMONS. By the Rev. FRANCIS B. WOODWARD, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen's, Dublin. In 12mo. 7s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

VIII.

OCCASIONAL SERMONS. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. In Eight Numbers, price 1s. each. *Contents:*

No. 1. Counsels and Consolations in times of Heresy and Schism. No. 2. On Pleas alleged for Separation from the Church. No. 3. The Doctrine of Baptism with reference to Prevenient Grace. No. 4. An Inquiry whether the Baptismal Office of the Church of England may be interpreted in a Calvinistic sense. No. 5. Inquiry, Part 2; Argument from Internal Evidence. No. 6. Inquiry, Part 3; Argument from External Evidence. No. 7. The Church of England in 1711 and 1850. No. 8. The Church of England and the Church of Rome in 1850. Conclusion.

## IX.

- A HANDBOOK of GREEK SYNONYMES. From the French of A. PILLON, Librarian of the Bibliothèque Royale, Paris. Edited, with Notes, by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo, 6s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)

## X.

- LETTERS in Vindication of the CHURCH of IRELAND; addressed to an English Member of Parliament. By the Rev. JOHN M. MAGUIRE, B.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin; Vicar of Boyle, in the Diocese of Elphin. In small 8vo. 6s. (*Now ready.*)

## XI.

- A GENERAL VIEW of the DOCTRINE of REGENERATION in BAPTISM. By CHRISTOPHER BETHELL, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bangor. *Fifth Edition.* In 8vo. 9s. (*Now ready.*)

## XII.

- A SECOND VOLUME of PAROCHIAL SERMONS. By the Rev. THOMAS AINGER, B.D., Vicar of Hampstead, Middlesex. In 12mo. (*Preparing for publication.*)

## XIII.

- The GREEK TESTAMENT; with a critically revised Text; a Digest of various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; and a copious Critical and Exegetical Commentary in English. Including the results of the labours of the most recent foreign Commentators. For the Use of Theological Students and Ministers. By HENRY ALFORD, M.A., Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 2 vols. 8vo. VOL. I. 1l. 4s.

## XIV.

- The CHURCH SCHOOLMASTER. By the Rev. SANDERSON ROBINS, M.A. In small 8vo. 5s. (*Just published.*)

## XV.

- The CHRISTIAN LIFE: a Manual of Sacred Verse. By the Rev. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Author of "The Omnipresence of the Deity." Third Edition. In a pocket volume. 5s. (*Just published.*)

## XVI.

- FAMILY READING; or, the NEW TESTAMENT NARRATIVE arranged and explained from the Writings of the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of England. By the Hon. Sir EDWARD CUST. In 8vo. (*In the press.*)

*Lately published, by the same Author (uniformly printed),*

- SUNDAY NIGHT READING, made applicable to the PROPER LESSONS from the OLD TESTAMENT, for the Sundays throughout the Year. 8vo. 15s.

## XVII.

The **CHRISTIAN CHARACTER**: Six Sermons preached in Lent. **CONTENTS**:—1. The Christian's Faith. 2. The Christian's Love. 3. The Christian's Hope. 4. The Christian's Charity. 5. The Christian's Joy and Sorrow. 6. The Christian prepared for Death. By **JOHN JACKSON, M.A.**, Rector of St. James's, Westminster, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. *Second Edition.* In small 8vo. 4s.

## XVIII.

**ONE LORD, ONE FAITH**: Discourses, Doctrinal and Occasional. By **JOHN BESLY, D.C.L.**, Vicar of Long Benton, and sometime Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. In 8vo. 12s. (*Just published.*)

## XIX.

A **NEW EDITION** of The **BOOK of COMMON PRAYER** and **ADMINISTRATION** of the **SACRAMENTS**, with copious **NOTES**, Practical and Historical, from approved Writers of the Church of England; including the Canons and Constitutions of the Church. Selected and arranged by **RICHARD MANT, D.D.**, late Lord Bishop of Down and Connor.

\* \* \* This Edition is printed uniformly with D'Oyly and Mant's Family Bible, and verbatim from the Quarto Edition. It will be completed in Six Monthly Parts, price 4s. each, forming one Volume, super-royal 8vo. **PARTS I. to V. are now ready.**

\* \* \* The **QUARTO Edition** may still be had, price 1l. 16s.

## XX.

**SCRIPTURAL COMMUNION with GOD**; or, the **PENTATEUCH**, and the **BOOK of JOB**; arranged in **HISTORICAL** and **CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER**, and newly divided into sections for daily reading; with **INTRODUCTIONS**, and **PRAYERS**; and **NOTES** for the Student and Inquirer. By the Rev. **GEORGE TOWNSEND, D.D.**, Canon of Durham. Complete in 2 vols. 8vo. 2l. 5s.

## XXI.

**PAROCHIAL SKETCHES.** In Verse. By the Rev. **ROBERT WILSON EVANS, B.D.**, Vicar of Heversham, Author of "The Rectory of Valehead," and "The Bishopric of Souls." *With Woodcuts.* In small 8vo. 6s.

## XXII.

**CABRAMATTA, and WOODLEIGH FARM.** By Mrs. **FRANCIS VIDAL**, Author of "Tales for the Bush," &c. Any profits from the sale of this Edition will be offered to the Bishop of Sydney, for the Cathedral. In royal 18mo. 6s. 6d.

*Lately published, by the same Author,*

1. **TALES for the BUSH.** *Third Edition.* 5s.
2. **WINTERTON**; a Tale. 3s. 6d.

## XXIII.

The REMAINS of the late Rev. HENRY FRANCIS LYTE, A.M., Incumbent of Lower Brixham, Devon; consisting of hitherto unpublished Poems, a few Sermons, &c. With a brief Prefatory Memoir. In small 8vo. (*In the press.*)

## XXIV.

The HISTORY of EUROPE during the FOUR LAST CENTURIES. For the Use of Schools and Young Persons. Edited by the Rev. JOHN SEDGWICK, M.A., Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford, one of the Masters in the Ordnance School, Carshalton. In small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

## XXV.

The ATHENIAN STAGE: a Handbook for the Student. From the German of Witschel, by the Rev. R. B. PAUL, M.A., and the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A. In 12mo. (*In the press.*)

## XXVI.

HOLY THOUGHTS; a TREASURY of TRUE RICHES, collected chiefly from our Old Writers. *Fifth Edition.* In pocket size. 1s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

## XXVII.

LECTURES on the APOCALYPSE, Critical, Expository, and Practical; delivered before the University of Cambridge; being the HULSEAN LECTURES for 1848. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. *Second Edition.* To this Edition is added, A DISCOURSE on the MAN of SIN (which may be had separately, to complete the former Edition). In 8vo. 14s.

*\*\* A SUPPLEMENTAL VOLUME, containing the ORIGINAL GREEK TEXT, with MSS. Collations, and an ENGLISH TRANSLATION and HARMONY, with Notes, and an APPENDIX to the LECTURES, is now ready.* In 8vo. 12s.

## XXVIII.

HANDBOOK of MODERN GEOGRAPHY and HISTORY. Translated from the German of Pütz, by the Rev. R. B. PAUL, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; and edited by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. (*Nearly ready.*)

*Lately published, by the same Editors, (uniformly printed,)*

The HANDBOOK of ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY and HISTORY. 6s. 6d.

The HANDBOOK of MEDIÆVAL GEOGRAPHY and HISTORY. 4s. 6d.

## XXIX.

SERMONS. By HENRY ALFORD, B.D., Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Hulsean Lecturer. In 8vo. 10s. 6d. (*Now ready.*)



## XXX.

The GOSPEL NARRATIVE of the PASSION of OUR LORD HARMONIZED, with REFLECTIONS. By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. *Fourth Edition.* In small 8vo. 8s.

*Lately published, the other Volumes, viz.:*

1. The INTRODUCTION, containing THOUGHTS on the STUDY of the GOSPELS. 8s.—2. The NATIVITY. 8s. 6d.—3. The MINISTRY (Second Year). 8s.—4. The MINISTRY (Third Year). 8s. 6d.—5. The HOLY WEEK. 8s. 6d.—6. The RESURRECTION. 8s.

## XXXI.

SERMONS. By the Rev. HENRY HUGHES, M.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints, Gordon Square, and Afternoon Lecturer of St. Luke's, Old Street. In 8vo. 10s. 6d. (*Just published.*)

## XXXII.

The HOLY BIBLE, containing the OLD and NEW TESTAMENTS; with a COMMENTARY arranged in SHORT LECTURES for the Daily Use of Families. By the Rev. CHARLES GIRDLESTONE, M.A., Rector of Kingswinford, Staffordshire. *Re-issue.* PARTS I. to V. are published, price 6s. each. (*Now ready.*)

The arrangement of the Lectures has been adapted to the purpose of Family Reading; but the Exposition will be found equally available for private study; being at once explanatory and practical, and combining the result of much research into the labours of others, with the advantage of an uniform and constant interpretation of the whole Bible, by the same Expositor.

\* \* *This WORK is now in the course of re-publication in Twelve Monthly Parts, price 6s. each, forming Six thick Volumes, 8vo, price 3l. 12s. (at which price the Work may now be had complete.)*

## XXXIII.

CORPUS IGNATIANUM; or, a Complete Body of the Ignatian Epistles: Genuine, Interpolated, and Spurious, according to the three Recensions. With numerous Extracts, in Syriac, Greek, and Latin, and an English Translation of the Syrian Text; and an Introduction and copious Notes. By WILLIAM CURETON, M.A., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster. Royal 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d.

## XXXIV.

An ESSAY on the OFFICE of the INTELLECT in RELIGION, with especial Reference to the EVIDENCES of a REVELATION, and the PROOF of CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By WILLIAM EDWARD SCUDAMORE, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. In 8vo. 9s.

## XXXV.

PLAIN SERMONS on the HOLY SACRAMENTS and SERVICES of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. Preached in the Parish Church of Fordham, Cambridgeshire, in Lent, 1849. (Inscribed, by Permission, to the Rev. W. L. Jacobson, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.) By the Rev. BENJAMIN WILSON, B.A., Curate. In 12mo. 6s. 6d.

## XXXVI.

**CHURCH HYMNS; or, HYMNS for the SUNDAYS, FESTIVALS, and OTHER SEASONS of the ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR,** as observed in the Church of England. Compiled, with an Introduction, by **HENRY STRETTON, M.A.**, Perpetual Curate of Hixon, Diocese of Lichfield. In 18mo, 2s., or 20s. for a dozen Copies. (*Now ready.*)

## XXXVII.

**A GRAMMAR of the GREEK LANGUAGE,** for the use of Christ's Hospital; translated and revised, with Additions, from Ward's *Institutio Græcæ Grammatices Compendiaria*. By **WILLIAM HARRISON, M.A.**, of Brasenose College, Oxford, late one of the Classical Masters of Christ's Hospital. In 12mo. *Third Edition.* 4s.

## XXXVIII.

**A FIRST LATIN VERSE BOOK.** By the Rev. **THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A.**, Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Fourth Edition.* 2s.

*Also, by the same Author,*

1. **A SECOND PART**, containing further Examples. 1s.
2. **PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to LATIN VERSE COMPOSITION.** *Contents:*—1. "Ideas" for Hexameter and Elegiac Verses. 2. Alcaics. 3. Sapphics. 4. The other Horatian Metres. 5. Appendix of Poetical Phraseology, and Hints on Versification. *Second Edition.* 5s. 6d.

## XXXIX.

**A NEW GENERAL ECCLESIASTICAL DICTIONARY.**

By the Rev. **EDWARD H. LANDON, M.A.**, late of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. In 6 vols. 12mo. Vol. I. 12s. (*Just published.*)

This Work contains an Account of the Sees, Patriarchates, Religious Foundations, and Brotherhoods, together with Lists of the Archbishops and Bishops throughout Christendom, from the earliest times; also, a History of Sects; an Explanation of Rites and Ceremonies, and of Ecclesiastical and Ecclesiological Terms; and a copious Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Ecclesiastical Persons, with a List of their Writings.

*The SECOND VOLUME is in the press.*

*Lately published, by the same Author,*

**A MANUAL of COUNCILS of the CHURCH,** comprising the Substance of the most important CANONS. 12s.

## XL.

**ESSAYS on SUBJECTS connected with the REFORMATION in ENGLAND.** By the Rev. **S. R. MAITLAND, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A.**, sometime Librarian to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth. In 8vo. 15s.

*Lately published, by the same Author, (uniformly printed,)*

The **DARK AGES; ESSAYS** illustrating the RELIGION and LITERATURE of the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th Centuries. *Second Edition.* 12s.

## XLI.

The ENGLISH REVIEW, No. XXV., for APRIL, 1850.  
In 8vo. 6s. (*Just published.*)

CONTENTS:—1. Middling Classes. 2. Present Aspect of the Education Question. 3. Miss Martineau's Thirty Years' Peace. 4. The Gorham Case. 5. Milman's Life of Tasso. 6. Sir F. H. Doyle's *Œdipus*. 7. The Supremacy Question. 8. Mr. Wortley's Marriage Bill. 9. Notices, &c. 10. Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

## XLII.

A FIRST CLASSICAL ATLAS. Containing Fifteen Maps, coloured in outline. Edited by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 7s. 6d.

"These Maps are executed with great accuracy, and apparently quite free from that indistinctness and disproportion, which are the great faults of all our small maps. We think Mr. Arnold successful here as always: and he has done his part to render geography, as it should be, an additional inducement for work."—*Guardian*.

## XLIII.

HENRY'S FIRST LATIN BOOK. By THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Eighth Edition*. In 12mo. 3s. (*Just published.*)

\*.\* The object of this Work (which is founded on the principles of imitation and frequent repetition) is to enable the pupil to do exercises from the first day of his beginning his Accidence. It is recommended by the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education as an useful Work for Middle or Commercial Schools; and adopted at the *National Society's Training College* at Chelsea.

*Also, by the same Author,*

A SECOND LATIN BOOK and PRACTICAL GRAMMAR. *Fourth Edition*. 4s.

## XLIV.

A Collected Edition of the SACRED ALLEGORIES of the late Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A. With Memoir and Portrait of the Author. *Elegantly printed in one Volume*, post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

## XLV.

MEDITATIONS from the FATHERS of the FIRST FIVE CENTURIES, arranged as Devotional Exercises on the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER. Intended to promote Soundness in the Faith, and Holiness of Life. By the Rev. J. ENDELL TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. In 2 vols. small 8vo. 16s.

## XLVI.

GROTIUS de VERITATE RELIGIONIS CHRISTIANÆ. A New Edition, with ENGLISH NOTES and Illustrations. For the Use of Students. By the Rev. J. E. MIDDLETON, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Lecturer on Theology at St. Bees' College. In 12mo. 6s.

## XLVII.

**ADDRESSES on MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS.** By the Rev. JAMES S. M. ANDERSON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. George's Chapel, Brighton, and Preacher of Lincoln's Inn.

CONTENTS:—1. The Profitable Employment of Time. 2. Dr. Johnson. 3. Columbus. 4. Sir Walter Raleigh. 5. England and her Colonies.

In small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

## XLVIII.

**REPORTS of NEW CASES,** decided in the CHANCERY, COMMON LAW, and ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS, with an Abridgment of New Statutes affecting the Laws relating to the CHURCH and the CLERGY. Edited by H. W. CRIPPS, Esq. M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Part II. In 8vo. 5s.

\* \* \* This Part contains (amongst other Cases) all the stages of the Case of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter, in the Arches Court and the Privy Council.

*Lately published, PART I., price 5s.*

## XLIX.

**ELEMENTS of INSTRUCTION concerning the CHURCH,** and the English Branch of it; being an Introduction to the THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. In 12mo. 3s. 6d.

*Lately published, by the same Author,*

**THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS.** *Fifth Edition.* 8s. 6d.

## L.

**The FIRST GERMAN BOOK,** on the plan of "Henry's First Latin Book." By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and J. W. FRÄDERSDORFF, formerly of the University of Berlin. *Second Edition.* In 12mo. 5s. 6d.

## LI.

**SELECTIONS from CICERO. PART II.** (from the EPISTLES.) By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 5s.

*Lately published, PART I. (from the ORATIONS.) 4s.*

## LII.

**SERMONS on MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS; with TWO CHARGES,** delivered in the Years 1837 and 1838, in the Church of Northallerton. By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, D.D., Canon of Durham. In 8vo. 12s.

## LIII.

**A KEY to the EXERCISES,** in Mr. ARNOLD'S FIRST FRENCH BOOK, written (with the Author's sanction) by M. C. J. DELILLE, French Master at Christ's Hospital and Merchant Taylors' School. 2s. 6d. (*Just published.*)







